HARVARD THEOLOGICAL REVIEW
VOLUME XXXV OCTOBER, 1942 NUMBER 4

AN ANCIENT CHINESE MYSTERY CULT

HOMER H. DUBS
DUKE UNIVERSITY

ANCIENT China of the first century B.C., like ancient Greece, possessed more than one religion. There was the national state religion, worshipping the Supreme One (*Tai-yi*[1] 太一, also called Heaven [*Tien* 天] and the Lord on High [*Shang-di* 上帝]), the Five Lords on High (*Wu-di* 五帝 or *Wu-shang-di* 五上帝), the imperial ancestors, and other divinities, whose sacrifices were supported by the imperial government. For the educated, there were two philosophical religions, Confucianism and Daoism. For the common people, there were gods, spirits, and ghosts of various sorts, whose care was attended to by such professionals as shamans (mostly female), fortune-tellers, physiognomists, mediums, and exorcists. Such animistic cults were despised by the more intelligent Confucians, who considered them as mere superstition. The famous Confucian, Sün-dz (*ca.* 320–*ca.* 235 B.C.), had indeed denied the existence of all spirits.

Into the foregoing mixture of cults, which were similar to those found elsewhere in the same stage of civilization, there was precipitated, in 3 B.C., a new orgiastic cult, which swept across civilized China in much the way that the Dionysian orgies swept across Greece. This cult seems to have been essentially similar in nature to the mystery cults of the ancient Mediterranean world and to have been unlike other Chinese

[1] For the sake of a readier indication of Chinese pronunciation, I am using a modification of the current Wade-Giles romanization for Chinese words, adapted from that of Dr. Chas. S. Gardner (cf. his Chinese Traditional Historiography, p. xi). To change my romanization into the Wade-Giles system, for initial *p-*, *t-*, *k-*, *ch-*, substitute *p'-*, *t'-*, *k'-*, *ch'-*, respectively. For initial *b-*, *d-*, *g-*, *j-*, read *p-*, *t-*, *k-*, *ch-*. For initial *r-*, read *j-*. Before *i* and *ü*, for initial *ts-*, *dz-*, *s-*, read *ch'-*, *ch-*, *hs-*. Before other vowels, for *ts-* and *dz-*, read *ts'-* and *ts-*. For final *-zh*, read *-ih*. For *tz*, *dz*, *sz*, read *tz'u*, *tzu*, *ssu* (in each case respectively).

religions of the period. Because it is mentioned in only three passages, the true nature of this cult has not been understood by occidental writers, although it is extremely interesting for the history of religion.

The cult centered about an ancient Chinese mother goddess, the Mother Queen of the West (*Si-wang-mu* 西王母). In the first century B.C., she was a popular goddess. Her cult, like that of many other ancient Chinese divinities, has practically disappeared today. In discussing this orgiastic cult of 3 B.C., we must first understand the contemporary conception of this goddess. She has frequently been misunderstood by occidental writers,[2] and her nature was radically changed in subsequent

[2] Her name, *Si-wang-mu*, is a quite peculiar Chinese phrase, so that it has been given various interpretations. *Wang-mu* is a phrase used regularly to mean "Queen-mother," and her name has frequently been interpreted by sinologists to mean "Queen-mother of the West." But a Queen-mother implies a living reigning son, and nowhere in ancient literature are we told of *Si-wang-mu*'s son. Hence this phrase must mean "Mother and Queen [or goddess] in the West." This interpretation is confirmed by the fact that in popular usage she was called merely "the Mother" (cf. passage *23* ad finem). É. Chavannes, (Memoires historiques [hereafter denoted by Mh], II, 8) and É. Huber (Bulletin de l'École Française d'Extrême Orient [hereafter denoted by BEFEO], 4, 1904, 1128) have interpreted this name as I do.

Speculative sinologists have identified *Si-wang-mu* variously. A. Forke ('Mu Wang und die Könige von Saba,' Mitteil. d. Seminars f. Oriental. Studien, 7, 117–172) identified her with the Queen of Sheba, reviving an identification by Ch. de Paravey in 1853 ('Archéologie primitive. Traditions primitives conservées dans les hiéroglyphes des anciens peuples,' etc. in Annales de philosophies chrétienne. Cf. the devastating review by É. Huber, in BEFEO, 4, 1904, 1127–1131). A. H. Giles (Adversaria Sinica, 1–19, 'Who Was *Si wang mu?*') identified her with Juno. (Cf. the even more devastating review by P. Pelliot in BEFEO, 6, 1906, 416–421.)

J. Legge (Chinese Classics, III, proleg., 150–151) and É. Chavannes (Mh II, 7–8; V, app. II), following Ruan Yüan and certain other Chinese scholars, identify *Si-wang-mu* as a western tribe. There is, however, no positive evidence to support this interpretation of the name. It is based merely upon the circumstance that in certain very old Chinese texts, such as the Erh-ya (cf. passage *20*) and the Annals Written On Bamboo (cf. passage *6*), the term *Si-wang-mu* is used as if it were a place or tribal name. It is, however, a common feature of classical Chinese style to make no distinction between the use of personal, tribal, and place designations, so that the usage of this name in those sources is quite consistent with the interpretation of *Si-wang-mu* as a goddess. In view of the ample and uniform evidence, from the fourth century B.C. and later, that *Si-wang-mu* was a goddess, I see no reason for interpreting this name in any other manner. Pelliot, who is perhaps the most eminent living sinologist, after years of hesitation, has finally come to the conclusion that *Si-wang-mu* was a very ancient Chinese mythological figure and that from the first she was feminine (T'oung Pao 27, 1930, 392).

centuries,[3] so that it will be necessary first to assemble the evidence dating from before 3 B.C. concerning this goddess, in order to understand the development that took place at that date.

This divinity may have been one of the mother goddesses who have appeared in every ancient center of civilization. She may even date back to the matriarchal stage of Chinese culture, which preceded the historical period, and which has left traces in the Chinese language and elsewhere. On the bones used for divination by the Shang people in China during the second millennium B.C., there is mentioned a "Western Mother (*Si-mu*)," who may have been this goddess.[3a] Juang-dz, in the fourth century B.C., speaks of her as an eternal being, living upon a mountain:

(*1*) The Mother Queen of the West attained it [the *Dao*], and thereby secured her place on the Narrow [Mountain] (*Shao-guang*); no one knows her beginning, no one knows her end.[4]

By the last century B.C., she was coupled, in artistic representations, with a male counterpart, the Father King of the East (*Dung-wang-fu* 東王父).[5] This Father is, however, plainly an invention of a much later date than the Mother, for he receives no mention in the texts of the period and none in her cult.

[3] After the Former Han period (206 B.C.–A.D. 23), popular Daoism made the Mother Queen of the West one of its divinities and developed her into a Daoist immortal, so that she has become quite unlike the goddess of Han times. She has been given nine sons and twenty-four daughters, a marvellous palace in the Kun-lun Mountains with a fountain of precious stones, where the magic Feast of Peaches is held every six thousand years. Women aged fifty are still presented with her image to lengthen their life, and offerings are made to her in times of drought. Cf. E. T. C. Werner, Myths and Legends of China, 136–138; Dictionary of Chinese Mythology, 163–164.

[3a] Cf. H. C. Creel, The Birth of China, 180. (Reference from Mrs. C. W. Bishop.)

[4] From ch. 6, 3: 11a (this and other Chinese works are quoted, except where noted, by the paging in the Commercial Press's "Sz-ku Tsung-kan"); also translated in Yu-lan Fung, Chuang Tzu, 118. This chapter is generally considered to be genuine.

Shao-guang 少廣 was interpreted anciently as the name of a cave, a mountain, or a region in the west. I have understood it as referring to a tall narrow peak, suitable for spying upon the country. (Do the Han hill-censers and hill-jars denote this mountain?)

[5] Cf. É. Chavannes, Mission Archéologique, tome I, partie 1, 123–125, 232, 264, figs. 1211, 1212; Pl. XLIV, XLV, fig. 75, 76, where the Father and Mother were stationed opposite each other (cf. W. Fairbank, 'The Offering Shrines of "Wu Liang Tz'u",' Harvard Journal of Asiatic Studies, 6, 1941, 19, 20). In this representation, dating from A.D 147, the Mother Queen is represented with wings.

He seems to have been a concession to first century B.C. Chinese ideas of propriety — a circumstance that likewise indicates the great antiquity of this goddess.

She was anciently described as having a therianthropic form. The Shan-hai-jing 2: 14b declares:

(*2*) Three hundred fifty *li* farther west are the Jade Mountains (*Yü-shan*). Here is where the Mother Queen of the West lives. The form of the Mother Queen of the West is like that of a human being, with a leopard's tail, tiger's teeth, which are good for whistling, and tangled hair. She wears a tall jade comb [or plume] in her hair. She has charge of Heaven's calamities upon the five [types of] crimes.[6]

This therianthropic form confirms the extreme antiquity of the Mother; in Han grave-sculptures, two of the most ancient Chinese divinities, Fu-hsi and Nü-gua, are represented with human bodies and scaly serpent's tails instead of feet.[7] Many of the Shan-hai-jing's supernatural beings are therianthropic in form.

Even more important is the function of the Mother Queen, indicated by the last sentence of passage *2*. Heaven was the highest of all ancient Chinese gods and was believed to exercise a moral government over mankind. The Mother Queen was then one of Heaven's deputies. Being located on a high mountain in the west, she could survey the world of China, and so send appropriate calamities or misfortunes upon those who had done evil.[8]

[6] The Shan-hai-jing 山海經 (lit., "The Classic of Mountains and Seas") is a composite book; this chapter probably dates from before the second century B.C., certainly before 6 B.C.; cf. H. Maspero, La Chine antique, 610, n. 1.

[7] Cf. Chavannes, Mission Archéologique, I[1], 126–130; Pl. XLIV, fig. 75.

[8] Shan-hai-jing 2: 13a states that "the high Kun-lun Mountains are verily the lower capital city of the Lord of Heaven."

Guo Po 郭璞 (276–324) glosses passage *2* as follows: "She has charge of the emanations which produce calamities, the five types of punishments, injury, and violent death." (His explanation implies a philosophic background of a later date than that in passage *2*, in that he believes the Mother merely to set free emanations [*chi* 氣], which in turn produce calamities, etc., instead of sending them directly.)

It is noteworthy that the conception of punishment after death does not appear in connection with the Mother Queen. This conception did not enter China until Buddhism brought it in the first century A.D. For Han China, retribution is confined to this life.

Passage *2* constitutes a quite adequate disproof of the assertion by H. Maspero ('The Mythology of Modern China,' in Asiatic Mythology, 382), that *Si-wang-mu*

Another passage from the same chapter adds an item concerning this goddess:

(*3*) Moreover, two hundred twenty *li* westwards there is the Mountain With Three Precipitous Summits (Mt. San-wei). The three green birds live on this mountain.[9]

The opening of the twelfth chapter adds another detail:

(*4*) In the region within the [four] seas, in the northwestern corner, on going eastwards, there are the Snake Shaman Mountains (*Shê-wu-shan*). On top of them is a man holding a cup, facing eastwards, standing. They are also called the Tortoise Mountains (*Guei-shan*). Here there is the Mother Queen of the West, leaning upon a stool, wearing a high hair-comb, and carrying a cane. South of her are the three green birds, who bring food to the Queen Mother of the West on the north of the high Kun-lun Mountains.[10]

This passage evidently refers to a stone formation. It, however, provides ancient evidence concerning the three green birds. Since this goddess lived on top of a barren mountain, she had to be fed like Elijah in the desert.

---

was originally a Goddess of Epidemics, in command of the demons of the plague. Such a conception narrows her function unduly. His only evidence is passages *22*, *23*, and *24* of this paper. He interprets them to mean that "a terrible epidemic was announced, against which only those would be safe who placed upon their door certain charms of the Lady-queen of the West." E. Perceval Yetts (Catalogue of the George Eumorfopoulos Collection, II, 39) declares that Maspero's identification is questionable. W. Eberhard ('Beiträge zur kosmologischen Spekulation der Chinesen der Han-Zeit,' Baessler Archiv, Bd. XVI, Heft 1–2, p. 33) declares that *Si-wang-mu* was a "Dürregöttin," using as his evidence our passages *23* and *24*. Careful examination of those passages shows, however, that both these assertions are misunderstandings. According to Liu Hsin's 劉歆 preface to the Shan-hai-jing (dated 6 B.C.), this book contains the outstanding account of popular Han mythology and its first thirteen chapters (at least) were read widely in Han times. Its evidence has then a very high value for Han popular beliefs.

[9] From Shan-hai-jing 2: 16b.

Mt. San-wei 三危之山 is mentioned in the Book of History, II, i, 12 (Legge's trans., 'Chinese Classics,' III, p. 40); III, i, 78 (p. 125); III, ii, 6 (p. 132). Guo Po states that it is "in the present Dun-huang Commandery." Sadao Aoyama's Shina Rekidai Chimei Yoran 支那歷代地名要覽, 241, locates these mountains 20 *li* southeast of Dun-huang 敦煌 (which is in 94° 47′ E, 40° 8′ N). This place was then not far from the Mother Queen's mountain (cf. passage *19*).

Guo Po glosses passage *3*, "The three green birds have charge of bringing food to the Mother Queen of the West. They nest apart from her on this mountain."

[10] Shan-hai-jing 12: 1a. This chapter was taken by the compilers of the Shan-hai-jing from another work than that now in ch. 2. Ch. 12 probably dates from the second or first century B.C.; cf. Maspero, La Chine antique, 610, n. 1.

A later passage from the same book contains two more descriptions of this goddess:

(5) On the south of the Western Sea, and on the shores of the Shifting Sands, back of the Red River and in front of the Black River, there are great mountains called the Kun-lun Mts. They are inhabited by a deity with the face of a human being and the body of a tiger and with stripes and a tail, both of which are [spotted with] white. Below these [mountains] there is the abyss of the Weak River [11] which encircles them. Beyond them there is the Mountain that Flames Fire.[12] If things are thrown into it, they immediately burn up. [In these Kun-lun Mts.] there is a person, wearing a high hair-comb, with tiger's teeth, a leopard's tail, living in a cave, called the Mother Queen of the West. In these mountains, all varieties of creatures are all found.[13]

Around the figure of this Mother Queen of the West, various legends collected. The Annals Written on Bamboo assert that King Mu of the Jou dynasty visited the Mother Queen of the West and that, as was proper, she repaid the visit:

(6) In the seventeenth year [of his reign],[14] the King made an expedition to the west, to the high Kun-lun Mts., and had an interview with the Mother Queen of the West. That year, the Mother Queen came to his court. She was entertained as a guest in the Jao Palace.[15]

[11] The Weak River 弱水 probably got its name because it had not the strength to flow into the ocean like other rivers. Guo Po, however, glosses, "Its water cannot support goose-down."

[12] This volcano is mentioned in the Book of History, III, iv, 6 (Legge, p. 168; cf. his notes). In the Tien-shan (lit., "the Mountains of Heaven"), north of the present Kucha, Chinese Turkestan, there was anciently a volcano. Li Dao-yüan 酈道元 (died 527), in his Shui-jing-ju 水經注 2: 13a (Wang Sien-chien's 王先謙 ed.), quotes Shzh Dao-an's 釋道安 (lived third or fourth century) Record of the Western Frontier Regions (Si-yu-ji 西域記), "Two hundred *li* [*ca.* 50 miles in Han times] north of Chü-tz 屈茨 [the present Kucha] there is a mountain on which in the night there is the light of fire and in the daytime there is smoke." Kucha is north of the Taklamakan desert, while the ancient Kun-lun Mountains were south of it, so that the phrase in the text, "beyond them," must be interpreted liberally. Before Han times, Chinese Turkestan was very little known.

[13] Shan-hai-jing 16: 4b, 5a. This chapter was added to the book by Guo Po in the fourth century A.D., but it undoubtedly contains quite ancient material.

In this passage, Guo Po seems to have combined two different ancient descriptions of the Mother Queen.

[14] This year was 985 B.C., according to the classical chronology, but 946 B.C. by the (more probably correct) chronology of the Annals Written on Bamboo.

[15] Ju-shu Ji-nien 竹書紀年 B: 9b, 10a. This work is a set of annals ending with the year 299 B.C., so that they represent ideas of the fourth century B.C. and much earlier. This book was buried in a tomb of that date, lost, and recovered in A.D. 281. Subsequently it suffered alterations, chiefly excisions, in the tenth to thirteenth centuries.

The Memoirs of [King] Mu, the Son of Heaven, amplify the above tradition into a truly mythological story:

(7) The Son of Heaven made an expedition westwards, . . . and on the day *guei-hai* [the last day of the Chinese sexagenary cycle], he reached the country of the Mother Queen of the West.

On the auspicious [first] day [of the cycle, the day] *jia-dz*, the Son of Heaven was entertained as a guest by the Mother Queen of the West. He thereupon bore a white jade sceptre (*guei*) and a black jade circular disk [as his symbols of rank]. At his interview with the Mother Queen of the West, he presented her with a hundred pieces of flowered silk and ribbon and a hundred catties of gold and jade.[16] The Mother Queen of the West bowed repeatedly and received them.

On the [next day, the day] *yi-chou*, when the Son of Heaven was banqueting the Mother Queen of the West on the Green Jasper Pool, the Mother Queen of the West sang without accompaniment [the following song] to the Son of Heaven:

"Like the white clouds in heaven,
Mountains and hills spontaneously arise.
Our marches and hamlets are distant from one another
And mountains and streams intervene.
Yet if you, sir, do not die,
I hope that you will be able to return here."

The Son of Heaven answered her, saying:

"I must return to my land in the east
To bring peace and order to the Chinese people.
When all the people are tranquil and in harmony
I shall think affectionately of visiting you.
At the end of the third year,
I will return to your wilderness." [17]

Yet it is fundamentally sound and contains quite ancient material; cf. C. S. Gardner, Chinese Historiography, 7, n. 1.

Passage *6* is also translated by E. Biot, in Journal Asiatique, 3me serie, XIII, 1842, 391–392, and by J. Legge, in 'Chinese Classics,' III, prolegomena, 150–151.

[16] The present text reads "three hundred pieces of *wu*-ribbon." *Wu* 錯 is plainly a textual error — it is an unknown word. I have followed Guo Po's quotation of this passage in a note to Shan-hai-jing 2: 15a.

[17] Nowhere is there any account of the King's return.

In his quotation of this passage (cf. n. 16), Guo Po has a third song at this point, which adds to the romantic effect:

The Mother Queen of the West for a second time chanted sighingly to the Son of Heaven, saying:

"When you come to this western land,
To dwell in this place,
Tigers and leopards will form troops for you,
Large and small birds will dwell with you.
Your happy life will have no end
And I will be my Lord's spouse.

The Son of Heaven drove to and ascended Mt. Yen-[dz, where the sun descends in the evening], and thereupon recorded his deeds upon the rocks of

"You will be [deathless, belonging to] all generations,
And I will moreover secrete you.
For you I will 'blow organ-pipes until their tongues are all moving' [a line from Book of Odes, II, I, i, 1 (Legge's trans., 'Chinese Classics,' IV, 245)]
Until in your heart of hearts you will be 'free from all concern,' [A phrase from ibid., I, VIII, x, 4 (Legge, 160)]
And of all the people of the world
Only Heaven's [bliss] will equal yours."

In the present text, after the next paragraph concerning King Mu's visit to Mt. Yen-dz, there is a different version of this third song:

At the Mountain of the Mother Queen of the West, he thought of returning home, for he remembered the people of the world. He became sad and chanted, saying,

"When I came to this western land,
And dwelt in this waste,
Tigers and leopards formed troops for me,
Crows and small birds dwelt with me,
My happy life has had no end
And I have been a god.

"But a Son of Heaven has a high duty
Of which he cannot be worthy.
When I think of the benefits of the people of the world,
My tears flow and suddenly fall.

"When you 'blow the organ-pipes until their tongues are all moving,'
And in my heart of hearts I am 'free from all concern,'
All the people of the world
Have only Heaven upon whom to depend."

This song is merely a variant of the other one quoted by Guo Po. One or two words have been changed, and the second stanza has been added. But the four-word regularity has been spoiled: a word has been taken from the end of line 6 and an extra word put into line 10. The result of this change has been to alter the goddess's seductive song into the King's assertion of his duty, making him treat her as Aeneas did Dido. Since tense, voice, and conjunctions are usually omitted in Chinese, and personal subjects are not expressed unless they are emphatic, this radical alteration of the meaning necessitated comparatively little change in the text. The change was probably made by someone who thought that an attempt by a great goddess to seduce a visiting King was undignified and immoral.

Both these versions of the third poem cannot date from the archaic period (fourth century B.C. or earlier), because they both use in the nominative case the archaic Chinese dative and objective first personal pronoun, *wo* 我. The second poem uses the correct nominative first personal pronoun, *wu* 吾. Between the fourth and the second centuries B.C., the distinction between these two pronouns was dropped. This third poem is probably a later addition, possibly by Guo Po, written after this book was found in A.D. 281. The underlying concept, that the Mother Queen attempted to in-

Mt. Yen-[dz] and planted a *huai* tree upon it. He called its peak the Mountain of the Mother Queen of the West.[18]

There seems to have been a somewhat different version of the above account current in the first century B.C. Sz-ma Tsien (died *ca.* 80 B.C.) summarizes this story as follows:

(*8*) King Mu made Tsao-fu his charioteer and made a trip of inspection to the west, where he had an interview with the Mother Queen of the West. He was so pleased with her that he forgot to return. But King Yen of Sü rebelled. King Mu, whose horses could gallop a thousand *li* in a day, attacked King Yen of Sü and routed him severely.[19]

The foregoing story of King Mu's visit must be classed with mythology or romance, rather than with religion.

---

duce the King to return to her, is, however, found in the two genuine poems, so that the third poem merely elaborates the original conception.

[18] Mu Tien-dz Juan 穆天子傳, ch. 2, 3; 2: 8b, 3: 1a–2a. This book was found in the same tomb with the Annals Written on Bamboo, and also dates from before 299 B.C. It, however, bears the character of a romance, not of a serious history. Cf. Gardner, Chinese Historiography, 44, n. 53; A. Hummel, Autobiography of a Chinese Historian, 80, n. 4, is more sceptical of it.

Passage 7 is also translated by De-kun Jeng, in the Journal of the North China Branch of the Royal Asiatic Society, 64, 1933, 138–140.

[19] Shzh-ji 史記 43: 4, 5 (paging of Takigawa's ed.). It is also translated by Chavannes in Mh, V, 9–10.

The present text of the Memoirs of King Mu, the Son of Heaven, nowhere contains anything that would imply that the King forgot his duties in enjoying the Mother Queen's entertainment or that he was recalled by a rebellion. We then have here a different tradition that developed when the Memoirs of King Mu had been lost.

The Lie-dz 列子, which Maspero (La Chine antique, 491, n. 1) believes to date from the end of the third century B.C., but which I, along with many recent Chinese critics, prefer to date in the third century A.D., amplifies the present text of the Memoirs of King Mu as follows (Lie-dz, ch. 3, A: 17a; also trans. by R. Wilhelm in his Lia Dsi, 31):

(*9*) Thereupon [King Mu] was entertained as a guest by the Mother Queen of the West and banqueted her on the Green Jasper Pool, where the Mother Queen of the West, without accompaniment, sang songs to the King and the King accompanied her. Their words are sad. Thereupon he looked upon the place where the sun enters [the earth for the night]. In one day he traveled ten thousand *li*. The King thereupon sighed and said, "Alas! If I were not so full of virtue, I could have yielded to her pleasures. But later generations would after my death have criticized me for it, [saying that] I had done wrong!"

In the Lie-dz, King Mu's trip is described as an illusion due to a magician. The Tien-wen 天問 (attributed to Chü Yüan 屈原 [*ca.* 340–*ca.* 290 B.C.]) couples King Mu's wanderings with a magician (cf. A. Conrady, Das Älteste Dokument zur Chinesische Kunstgeschichte, T'ien-wen, 135–137, v. 137–139), but does not mention the Mother Queen of the West. The legend of this Mother evidently belonged to north China, not to the Yangtze valley, where Chü Yüan lived.

The Annals Written on Bamboo also state that this goddess came to pay court to the very ancient mythological ruler, Shun, who, in the Shan-hai-jing, is the most important of all the mythological culture heroes. These Annals state that in his reign,

(*10*) In his ninth year, the Mother Queen of the West came to pay him court.[20]

The Book of Rites Compiled by the Elder Dai echoes this statement. In connection with a discussion of Shun, it says:

(*11*) The Mother Queen of the West came [to his court] and presented a white stone flute.[21]

The foregoing statement is repeated, with a slight addition, in the Great Commentary On the Book of History:

(*12*) In the time of Shun, the Queen Mother of the West came [to his court] and presented a white jade flute.[22]

Shun was ranked by Confucians among the greatest of the sages, so that they naturally thought it only appropriate for a great goddess to come and pay court to him. This legend, which came to be interpreted as subordinating a popular goddess to a philosophic cult, was most likely current chiefly in educated circles. A consequence of this legend is found in the chapter of miscellaneous sayings in the works of the much earlier Sün-dz:

(*13*) Yao studied with Yin-shou,[23] Shun studied with Wu-cheng Jao,[24] and Yü studied with the Mother Queen of the West.[25]

[20] Ju-shu Ji-nien A: 8a; also trans. by Biot in Jour. Asiat., 3me serie, XII, 550, and by Legge, 'Chinese Classics,' III, proleg., 115.

[21] Da-Dai Li-ji 大戴禮記, 11: 12b, ch. 76, sect. 5; also trans. by R. Wilhelm in his Li Gi, 97. This book was compiled in the first century B.C., out of older materials.

[22] Shang-shu-Da-juan 尙書大傳 2: 6b. This book was supposed to have been compiled out of older materials by Master Fu 伏生, who died some time during 179–157 B.C. It was lost in the fourteenth century, and its fragments were collected and published in the eighteenth century. This passage is quoted by Meng Kang 孟康 (lived during 220–240 A.D.) in a note to Han-shu 漢書 21 A: 3a (paging of Wang Sien-chien's ed.), also elsewhere.

[23] The text reads Jün-shou 君疇, but Han-shu 20: 17a and other early authors read Yin-shou 尹壽.

[24] Han-shu 30: 50b, 70b, 81a list his works, with Ban Gu's note to the first of these, "Not an ancient work."

[25] Sün-dz 荀子 19: 3b, fascicle 27 (Wang Sien-chien's ed.). Instead of "Mother

Since the Mother Queen paid court to Shun, it would have been only natural for Shun's successor to have studied with her. Here she is made out to be a Confucian teacher.

The later part of the Shan-hai-jing contains a description of the Mother Queen's country:

(*14*) To the west are the Mountain of the Mother Queen, the Precipitous Mountains, and the Ocean-[bordering] Mountains, where there is the Country of Satisfaction, which satisfies its people. In this place are the Fields of Satisfaction. Phoenix eggs are their food and sweet dew [26] is their drink; everything that they desire is always ready for them.

Furthermore there are "sweet flowers," [27] "sweet Chaenomeles japonica" [28] white willows, the *Shzh-ru*,[29] the thrice-piebald,[30] the *süan*,[31] red jasper, green jasper, and deep green jade, Excoecaria japonicum, the white coral tree,[32] white cinnabar, green cinnabar, with much silver and iron. *Luan*-birds [33] spontaneously sing there and phoenixes spontaneously dance there.

Furthermore there are all kinds of animals, which form flocks in this place, so that it is called the Fields of Satisfaction. There are the three green birds, with red heads and black eyes. One is named the Great Pelican, one is named the Lesser Pelican, and one is named the Green Bird.[34]

Queen of the West (*Si-wang-mu* 西王母)," the present text reads *Si-wang-guo* 國, lit., "The Country of the King [or Queen] of the West." But this phrase does not make sense, and no person or place, real or mythical, by the name of *Si-wang-guo* is known. The characters *guo* and *mu* are similar, so that they might have easily been confounded by a copyist. I have emended *guo* to *mu*.

[26] "Sweet dew" was a Chinese mythological liquor; cf. H. H. Dubs, trans., The History of the Former Han Dynasty (hereafter denoted by HFHD), II, ch. 8, n. 21. 5.

[27] Shan-hai-jing 15: 5a declares, "To the east there are 'sweet flowers' 甘華, whose branches and trunk are all red, with yellow leaves."

[28] Shan-hai-jing 15: 5a declares, "On it there is 'sweet Chaenomeles japonica (*gan-ja* 甘柤),' whose branches and trunk are all red, with yellow leaves, white flowers, and black fruit."

[29] Guo Po glosses the mention of this creature 視肉 in Shan-hai-jing 6: 3b as follows: "It stores up flesh. Its shape is like an ox's liver. It has two eyes. When one has eaten of it, but has not eaten it up, suddenly it revives and is renewed just as it was before."

[30] Shan-hai-jing 15: 5a declares, "There there are green horses and there are red horses, whose name is thrice-piebald (*san-jui* 三騅)." Guo Po glosses ibid. 14: 4a as follows: "A horse with green and white mixed hair, making it piebald."

[31] The *süan* 璇 was a precious stone.

[32] White coral 琅玕 was supposed to grow in the Kun-lun Mountains, on trees. It is said to have been like pearls.

[33] Shan-hai-jing 2: 7b–8a declares, "There are birds, whose shape is like that of a tartar pheasant, with stripes of all colors. Their name is the *luan* 鸞 bird. When they appear, the world is peaceful and tranquil." Guo Po glosses, "According to an old explanation, the *luan* is a bird like a chicken. It is an auspicious bird. In the time of King Cheng of the Jou dynasty, the western Rung barbarians presented one to him." The *luan* was a mythological bird of the phoenix species.

[34] Shan-hai-jing 16: 2b–3a. This passage precedes that translated in passage *5*.

There are a few other passages from Former Han times referring incidentally to this goddess. The famous poet of Emperor Wu's court, Sz-ma Siang-ru (died 117 B.C.) mentions the Mother Queen in his Prose-poem on the Great Emperor (Da-ren-fu):

(*15*) I went back and forth among the Yin Mts. and soared in great curves,
So that I have moreover today looked upon the Mother Queen of the West.
She is brilliant with her white head and high jade comb, yet she dwells in a cave.
She also fortunately has her three green birds [35] to be her messengers.
If I were certain to live as long as she and not die,
Altho I were to traverse ten thousand ages, it would not be enough to make me glad.[36]

The Huai-nan-dz alludes poetically to this goddess:

(*16*) When a rebellious person brings his machinations to completion, . . . the aged old lady of the west breaks her tall hair-comb [in despair] and the spirit of the Yellow [Lord] sighs.[37]

Another passage connects her specifically with immortality:

(*17*) It is like when Yi begged from the Mother Queen of the West the drug that keeps one from dying, and Heng-o stole it, used it, and took refuge in the moon. He was disappointed, was deprived of [his wife], and had no way of replacing [the lost drug].[38]

[35] The text reads "three-footed crow," which mythological creature was, however, located in the sun and not anciently connected with the Mother Queen. Hence I have emended this phrase. The respective characters are quite similar to each other.

[36] Quoted in Han-shu 57 B: 17b, 18a.

Jang Yi 張揖 (lived during 227–232) glosses, "These Yin Mts. are in the Kun-lun Mts., 2700 *li* to the west. The figure of the Mother Queen of the West is like that of a human being, with a leopard's tail, a tiger's head, and tangled hair which shines on her white head. She has a stone capital city with a golden house and a cave in which she lives. The three green birds . . . have charge of taking food to the Mother Queen of the West on the north of the high Kun-lun Mts."

[37] Huai-nan-dz 淮南子 6: 8a. This work was written for Liu An 劉安, King of Huai-nan (died 122 B.C.), by eight of his learned men. The "aged old lady of the west" is of course the Mother Queen. Here she is merely one of the great gods who care for the well-being of the country.

[38] Huai-nan-dz 7: 10a. Gao Yu 高誘 (wrote 205–212) glosses: "Heng-o 恆娥 [now called Chang-o 嫦娥] was the wife of Yi 羿 [the divine archer], who had begged the drug from the Mother Queen of the West. Before he had taken it, Heng-o stole and ate it, so that she succeeded in becoming an immortal. She took refuge [from Yi] in the moon." A more modern version of this myth is to be found in Werner, Myths and Legends, 183–188.

In Yang Hsiung's Prose-poem (*fu*) on the Gan-tsüan Palace, he says:

(*18*) I thought of the Mother Queen of the West lovingly offering toasts.[39]

The location of the Mother Queen of the West's mountain is furnished by one of Ban Gu's notes in his chapter entitled, The Treatise on the Principles of Geographical Arrangements (Di-li-jzh):

(*19*) Lin-chiang. Northwest, outside the border, there is the Stone Chamber of the Mother Queen of the West, north of the Lake of the Immortals and the Salt Pool.[40]

The "Lake of the Immortals" is identified as Kokonor.[41] The ancient Lin-chiang is the present Si-ning (101° 49′ E, 36° 37′ N), in Tsing-hai. The Mother Queen of the West was thus supposed to live on one of the present Southern Mountains (*Nan-shan*), which form the southern border to the westward extension of Kansu. This location must have been taken by Ban Gu from a document quite old in his day, for it is contradicted in other parts of his History.[42] Yet it was almost certainly the archaic Chinese location for this goddess.

The legend connecting the Mother Queen of the West with the pill of immortality appears first in the Huai-nan-dz. It is not in the Shan-hai-jing, where Yi is merely a great hero and archer, and where his shooting down of the nine superfluous suns is not even mentioned. This myth hence seems to date from the second century B.C., and is later than the more ancient conceptions in the Shan-hai-jing.

[39] Quoted in Han-shu 87 A: 17a. Yang Hsiung 揚雄 lived 53 B.C.–A.D. 18. The reference is of course to the goddess's entertainment of King Mu.

[40] Han-shu 28 Bi: 10a, b.

[41] By Sun Hsiao 孫校 (lived before the sixth century), in a note to Shui-jing-ju 2: 35b, where the above location is repeated.

[42] As Chinese geographical knowledge of regions west of China increased, the location of the Mother Queen of the West was pushed farther and farther westwards. A quite early passage in the Erh-ya 爾雅 (third century B.C. and earlier) B: 11a, ch. 9, says:

(*20*) Gu-ju, the Bo-hu, the Mother Queen of the West, and Rzh-hsia are the four outermost wildernesses.

Gu-ju 觚竹 was a northern region, known already in Shang times, extending from the present Lu-lung, Hopei to Jao-yang, Re-ho. It was then the very ancient "northernmost" region, north from the present Shantung. The Bo-hu 北戶 are the people who place "the doors of their houses on the north," because they live south of the sun — the ancient southernmost location. The Mother Queen of the West's mountain was where

The foregoing passages include all the existing Chinese data that I can find concerning the Mother Queen of the West, which date from Former Han times or earlier, except for the three which will be presented next.[43] This Mother Queen is delineated as a very ancient divinity, living in the far west on a mountain. She was a person who sends calamities, thereby punishing the wicked. We may speculate that she was originally similar to the Ainu "aunt of the marshes," who sends diseases [44] — a malevolent being, responsible for calamities, called a "mother" by euphemism. Her moral character may have only been acquired in the last half-millennium B.C., when the Chinese moralized their gods. By Han times, however, any malevolent character she may originally have had was forgotten. She had become an immortal goddess, kindly disposed to mankind, who could make her favorites immortal and give them a life of eter-

---

the sun went down, so that she naturally belongs in this list of the four quarters. Rzh-hsia 日下 was the region "below the place where the sun" comes out in the morning.

Since the Erh-ya early became one of the authoritative classics, the Queen Mother of the West came to be conceived as living in the westernmost country. When Jang Chien 張騫 and other Chinese envoys explored central Asia in the first century B.C., they naturally inquired for this goddess. Part of their report (Shzh-ji 123: 13 [also trans. by Hirth in Jour. Amer. Orient. Soc'y, 37, 1917, 97 (45), and by de Groot in Chinesische Urkunden zur Geschichte Asiens, II, Die Westlande China, 18]; this passage is repeated in Han-shu 96 A: 28b [trans. in de Groot, op. cit., 91]) contains the statement:

(*21*) According to the tradition of the elders in Parthia, in Tiao-jzh [Chaldaea] there is the Weak River and the Queen Mother of the West, but they have never been seen [there].

In 166 A.D., there arrived at the Chinese capital a man (probably a merchant) from the Roman empire, who called himself, "An envoy from the King of Rome, Aurelius" (cf. F. Hirth, China and the Roman Orient, 42 [33]); the Chinese also sent an envoy to the west, who seems to have reached the Persian Gulf, so that more accurate knowledge of the west was available. The Wei-lio 魏略 (written between 239 and 265) accordingly locates the Queen Mother of the West on a Jade Mountain west of a sea west of the Roman orient (cf. Hirth, op. cit., 77, [77]). This location was repeated by later historians (cf. ibid., 51, [21]; 43, [34]; 82, [37]; 86, [63]; 87, [71]; 95, [23]). This "scientific" location did not, however, affect the popular religious belief in Han times; knowledge of it was probably confined to a few learned men in the imperial court.

[43] The Secret Memoir of Emperor Wu of the Han Dynasty (Han Wu Nei-juan 漢武內傳) is devoted to a visit by the Mother Queen of the West to Emperor Wu, in which she gives the Emperor directions for becoming an immortal. This book is attributed to Ban Gu, but really dates from the fifth century A.D.

[44] Cf. John Batchelor, The Ainu and their Folklore, 41 ff.; E. W. Hopkins, History of Religions, 48.

nal happiness in her palace on top of the Kun-lun Mountains in the far west. She had offered these gifts to King Mu when he visited her, so that he had even forgotten his own kingdom. She had become a being like Demeter and Persephone, consequently it is not surprising to find developing about her a cult like that of the Greek mysteries.

Three brief sections in Ban Gu's History of the Former Han Dynasty constitute our sole sources for this new cult:

(*22*) In the fourth year [of the year-period, Jien-ping], in the spring, the first month [Feb./Mar., 3 B.C.], there was a great drought. East of the Han-gu Pass, the common people carried in procession the wands of the Mother Queen of the West. They passed thru commanderies and kingdoms and went west thru the Han-gu Pass to the imperial capital. The common people there also met and collected, sacrificing to the Mother Queen of the West. Some by night took fire up on top of buildings, beat drums, and cried out, exciting and frightening one another.[45]

(*23*) In the year-period Jien-ping, the fourth year, the first month, the common people were excited and ran, each holding a stalk of straw or hemp, carrying them on and passing them to one another, saying, "I am transporting the wand of the goddess's edict." Those who passed along and met on the roads were as many as thousands. Some let down their hair and walked barefoot. Some at night broke door-bars and some climbed over walls, entering houses. Some rode chariots or on horseback, galloping fast, or making themselves post-messengers to transmit and transport the wands. They passed and traveled thru twenty-six commanderies and kingdoms and came to the imperial capital.

That summer, in the imperial capital, the common people of the commanderies and kingdoms collected and met in the wards, lanes, and foot-paths, making sacrifices and setting out utensils for tablets [like dice, to throw lots, probably for divination], singing and dancing, sacrificing to the Mother Queen of the West. They also transmitted a writing which said, "The Mother informs her people that those who wear this writing will not die. Let those who do not believe my words look below their door-hinges, where there will be white hairs." In the autumn it stopped.[46]

(*24*) In the fourth year, the first month, the second month, and the third month [Feb.–May, 3 B.C.], the common people frightened each other, crying out and running, transmitting edicts and wands, and sacrificing to the Mother Queen of the West. They also said, "People with eyes placed vertically will come."[47]

[45] From The Annals of Emperor Hsiao-ai, Han-shu 11: 6b.

[46] From The Treatise on the Five Elements, which discusses portents; Han-shu 27 Ca: 22a.

[47] From The Treatise on the Ornaments of Heaven, which discusses astronomy and astrology, Han-shu 26: 59b.

Ban Gu, the author of this history, was himself a quite naturalistic Confucian, who was not interested in popular religious movements. But this Chinese cult was so different from other contemporary religions that it excited considerable attention. It spread over all northern China, from east to west, even reaching the imperial capital, so that it excited interest in the court. The provincial governors very likely mentioned it in their reports to the throne; the imperial interpreters of portents included it in the events they discussed.[48] Thus Ban Gu found it described in the written source material for Former Han times and included these three brief passages.

This outbreak of religious fervor was undoubtedly accentuated and possibly precipitated by the great drought recorded for this year. This religion started somewhere east of the Han-gu Pass (the present Tung-guan), i.e., in the present Shantung or Honan. Shantung has always been a center of popular religion and it is still occasionally the scene of religious excitement.

It is possible to guess at the theology behind this outburst of popular fervor. According to the then current theory, calamities were sent by Heaven because of deficiencies in the imperial government.[49] With the progressive development and individualization of moral ideals, it came to be seen how unjust such a divine procedure was to the individuals who suffered. The popular religion attributed this drought to the action of the Mother Queen of the West. But she, like other gods, had come to be thought of as just.[50] She was a Mother, who would not

[48] Their interpretations of its portentous meaning are quoted in the Han-shu; cf. HFHD, III, ch. 11, n. 6. 9, ad finem.

[49] No doctrine was more continuously reiterated in imperial edicts of the Former Han period. When a flood, earthquake, famine, cold spell, epidemic, comet, or some other calamity appeared, the emperor usually issued an edict in which he accepted the blame for the calamity, laying it upon the inadequacies of his government; cf. HFHD, I, 4: 9a, 16b; II, 8: 6b, 9a; 9: 2a, 3b, 4b, 5b; 10: 2b, 4a, 5b, 14a. In 7 B.C., after some solar eclipses, earthquakes, and floods, Emperor Ai said in an edict, "Owing to Our lack of virtue, the common people have suffered punishment in Our place." (HFHD, III, 11: 4a.)

[50] In 18 B.C., one of the imperial concubines, the Favorite Beauty née Ban 班婕妤, a great-aunt of Ban Gu, was accused of having practised black magic. She replied that if she had done evil and had tried to get the spirits or gods to aid her, if they had any knowledge of human activities, how could she hope not to be accused by them of dis-

deliberately destroy her children. The contradiction between the justice of the goddess and the injustice to individuals who suffered from the drought could be solved if the goddess would grant continued existence, in spite of the lack of food, to those individuals whom she favored. Thus the goddess came to be thought of as offering to her favorites escape from the calamity. It is natural that those persons who believed they had secured this favor should tell others about it, and should recount how they obtained this favor, whereupon other persons naturally went through the same procedure (rites), and a new soteriological religion was born. Something like the foregoing must have been the etiology of this cult.

What we know about the ceremonies of this cult is to be found only in passages *22*, *23*, and *24*. The wands, which were carried in procession, were undoubtedly symbols of the goddess's authority. It was an ancient Chinese custom for high officials, when attending court, to bear credentials, which were frequently in the shape of a short stick or tablet. Sometimes these wands were made of jade and were called *guei* 圭.[51] Imperial commissioners carried staffs, which were sometimes wooden writing tablets, nine to eighteen inches long, an inch wide, sealed with appropriate seals, called *dzie* 節 or *fu* 符.[52] For the wands of the Mother Queen, the common people seem to have used tree branches. These branches probably typified the tree of immortality, which is pictured on Han graves.[53] These wands were passed from one initiate to another, so that each person could be assured of having possessed the authoritative favor of the goddess. Subsequent to this development in her cult, the Mother Queen of the West was pictured with worshippers holding up towards her their wands, just as courtiers held their *guei* in court.[54]

---

loyalty to her lord; whereas if they had no knowledge, what good would it have done her to appeal to them? (Cf. HFHD, II, 366.) This dilemma implies that the gods and spirits are thoroughly moral beings.

[51] Cf. passage 7, paragraph 2.

[52] Cf. Mh, II, 129, n. 3; Chavannes, Documents Chinois, 30 f.

[53] Cf. Chavannes, Sculpture sur pierre en Chine, pl. X; Mission Archéologique, pl. XLVI, fig. 77.

[54] Cf. Chavannes, Sculpture, pl. XXXVIII, third register of the gable; Mission

Persons bearing credentials exercised the authority of the lord who issued these credentials. The Han emperors sometimes sent out commissioners with credentials authorizing them to levy and send out armies, execute high officials, or in other ways wield the imperial absolute authority. It is not then surprising to find that some devotees who bore the goddess's wands should have felt that this authority permitted them to enter houses (possibly to secure the food stored therein, in order to put into effect the goddess's edict that the wand bearers should not die). Others commandeered the imperial posts or other carriages, riding about the country to bear the gospel of the goddess's kindness to new places. Some took fire on top of houses, sending the good news to distant places by means of fire beacons. Some let down their hair and walked barefoot — a practice still used by Chinese pilgrims. Certain other ancient Chinese superstitions, such as that about the people with eyes placed vertically, also entered into this cult.[55] There were also other ceremonies, which the unsympathetic Confucian historian merely describes as making sacrifices and setting out tablets for divination, singing and dancing. These ceremonies developed into some sort of orgiastic performances. Ban Gu states that they "beat drums and cried out, exciting and frightening each other." [56] The therianthropic form of the goddess may have influenced the cult at this point.

Another feature is the charm, the wearing of which promised freedom from death.[57] Charms against disease and calamity were then worn by practically everybody, even by the emperor, nobles, officials, and students.[58] Chinese doors do not have

---

Archéologique, pl. LXXXVI, fig. 161; LXXXVII, fig. 162; vol. I[1], pl. DXV, fig. 1237; p. 80, 264.

[55] Cf. passage *24*. In one of the Elegies of Chu, entitled, The Great Summoning (Chu-tz 楚辭, 10: 3a, "Da-jao" 大招, attributed to Chü Yüan, more probably by a disciple, Jing Chai 景差 [third century B.C.]), the poet declares that among the spirits in the shoreless deserts of the west there is one

> With a pig's head and vertical eyes,
> Hairy, with disordered hair,
> Long claws, protruding teeth,
> And wild forced laughter.

[56] Cf. passage *22*.

[57] Cf. passage *23* ad finem.

[58] Cf. HFHD, III, ch. 99, app. III; Han-shu 99 B: 7a.

metal hinges; on the top and bottom at the hinge side of the door are wooden tenons, which fit into sockets in the door-frame. It is natural for hairs and other dirt to accumulate in the lower sockets. This charm was probably a device to reassure people who wanted something more than the mere bearing of the Mother's wands. To be all things to all people is a fundamental principle in most religions.

The cult died down in the autumn, when the harvest was gathered. We do not know whether this cult promised deathlessness merely during the drought or permanently. Passage *17* suggests the latter. If it was the former, the cult would naturally have ended at harvest-time. Even so, once temporary deathlessness had been secured, the demand for permanent deathlessness was sure to follow. We wish we knew the history of this cult after the year 3 B.C.; unfortunately it did not again attract attention in the court and is not mentioned again in history. Popular Daoism, which arose chiefly in the first and second centuries A.D., took over this demand for immortality, satisfying it by magical and miraculous practices.

To sum up: The Mother Queen of the West was in Former Han times an ancient Chinese goddess belonging to the popular religion, who was believed to live on top of a high mountain outside the western boundaries of China, whence she sent calamities to punish sins against Heaven. She seems to have been an extremely ancient divinity, dating perhaps from prehistoric ages, at which time she had possibly been a malevolent being. As a result of ancient Chinese mythology working upon her name, she developed into a mother goddess who was kindly disposed to mankind, and who offered immortality to her devotees. In 3 B.C., on the occasion of a great drought, this belief flowered into an orgiastic soteriological cult, which spread across north China from east to west. By bearing the Mother's wands in procession, by sacrifices, singing, dancing, orgies, and charms, deathlessness was offered to initiates. The great excitement of the cult's devotees attracted the attention of the imperial court and secured a brief mention for this religion in Chinese history. We know nothing of the subsequent history of this cult; it was probably taken up into popular Daoism.

The occurrence in ancient China of an orgiastic soteriological cult similar in some respects to the early stages of the Greek Dionysiac cult is a highly interesting circumstance, which shows how similar are religions in different parts of the world.

CORRECTION

In "Philo on Free Will," n. 48 (preceding issue of this Review, p. 140), with regard to the fourfold classification of the ten plagues in Philo and the Shibbale ha-Leḳet, the same classification is to be found in Tanḥuma, Wa-Era 14, and Shemot Rabbah 12. 4 and 15. 27. See Ginzberg, The Legends of the Jews, V, p. 426, n. 170.

H. A. Wolfson.

EDWARDS AND THE ARMINIANS ON THE FREEDOM OF THE WILL

CONRAD WRIGHT

Harvard University

Jonathan Edwards believed that the crucial point which divided Calvinists and Arminians was the freedom of the will; that by establishing the doctrine of moral necessity, the Calvinists would have a firm basis from which to confute Arminian objections to the doctrines of total depravity, efficacious grace, absolute, eternal, and particular election, and the perseverance of the saints.[1] His treatise on the Freedom of the Will was intended to give a final and crushing reply to his opponents, and in preparation for it he read widely and thought deeply. He believed that he had answered all objections, stopped all crevices in the argument, and written an unanswerable work. It appeared in 1754.

Whatever else its publication may have done, it produced a state of incredible intellectual confusion. Edwards's followers part of the time did not understand him; his opponents often found themselves in a maze of contradictions; and the historian is fortunate if he can finish a reading of the documents with a confident understanding of the arguments and a clear picture of the real issues involved. With some justice, James Dana of Wallingford introduced his discussion of foreknowledge with Milton's lines:

> Others apart sat on a hill retired,
> In thoughts more elevate, and reason'd high
> Of Providence, foreknowledge, will, and fate,
> Fix'd fate, free will, foreknowledge absolute,
> And found no end, in wand'ring mazes lost.[2]

Edwards might declare that the logic of the Calvinist position required an assertion of necessity, and a denial of what he believed was the Arminian view of the freedom of the will. In

[1] Jonathan Edwards, Works (New York, 1844), II, 176–179.

[2] James Dana, The "Examination of the Late Rev'd President Edwards's Enquiry on Freedom of Will," Continued (New Haven, 1773), 96.

actual fact, most New England Calvinists asserted that man was a free moral agent in about the same terms that the Arminians used. They were Covenant theologians, and had to argue that men had a power of choice when accepting the covenant. Edwards abandoned the Covenant theology for a more rigorous and higher-toned Calvinism; but that does not mean that all New England followed him. The Savoy version of the Westminster Confession, which was accepted as the standard, asserted free will without ambiguity: "God hath endued the Will of man with that natural liberty and power of acting upon choice, that it is neither forced, nor by any absolute necessity of Nature determined to do good or evil." Man in his innocency was free to do that which is good, "but yet mutably, so that he might fall from it." [3] Since the fall, the will is still free, but because of man's bondage to sin, he is free to do only evil, just as God, whose nature is holy, is free to do only that which is good. When the Calvinist Experience Mayhew declared that "Learned Men avouch, that God's Decrees respecting future Events, are consistent with the Liberty of free Agents, with Relation to what they do in effecting them," he referred specifically to the Confession as authority.[4] Arminians commonly insisted that Calvinism was really determinism; but there were always Calvinists ready to deny the charge. Stephen West and Samuel Hopkins adopted Edwards's position; but even the Edwardeans rapidly worked around to a reassertion of the freedom of the will.[5] Timothy Dwight, for example, declared that "*men are intuitively conscious of their own free agency, being irresistibly sensible, that they act spontaneously, and without any coercion, or constraint.*" [6] No Arminian could have said more.

The fact that Edwards was apparently departing from the accepted Calvinist doctrine was not lost on the Arminians. James Dana began his Examination of the Late Reverend President Edwards's "Enquiry on Freedom of Will" by setting aside as not germane to the discussion Edwards's system of

[3] Williston Walker, The Creeds and Platforms of Congregationalism (New York, 1893), 377.

[4] Experience Mayhew, Grace Defended (Boston, 1744), 156.

[5] Joseph Haroutunian, Piety versus Moralism (New York, 1932), Chapter IX.

[6] Timothy Dwight, Theology (Middletown, Conn., 1818), I, 248, 249.

doctrine. "It is only the *foundation principle* we aim to consider: The system built hereupon, whether true or false, is not, by the generality of Calvinistic Divines, made to depend on the *same* basis." [7] The sense of liberty Dana was defending was "so far from being the peculiar notion of '*Pelagians, Semi-Pelagians, Jesuits, Socinians, Arminians,* and others' of the same stamp, as Mr. Edwards injuriously represents, that it has been maintained by the most eminent divines called *Calvinists,* as we shall be ready to shew should there be occasion." [8]

For New Englanders, necessity was not a doctrine of the Calvinists, but of free-thinkers; and when Edwards produced the Freedom of the Will, he was classed, not with the Westminster divines, but with the Stoics, Hobbes, Leibnitz, Spinoza, and Collins. Edwards himself took note of the accusation that his position was that of Hobbes, and denied that he had ever read him.[9] Doubtless few of the Arminians had either, and it seems probable that they knew Leibnitz and Spinoza only by reputation. But they had read Samuel Clarke's Boyle Lectures on the being and attributes of God, which had been composed with Hobbes and Spinoza in mind. Clarke, too, had engaged in controversy with Leibnitz on liberty and necessity, and had replied to Collins. James Dana had read John Jackson's defence of liberty against Cato's letter, and his answer to Collins. He had also read Soame Jenyns's Letters on the Origin of Evil, which presented a doctrine of necessity; and Jenyns's status as a Christian was known to be doubtful. None of these supporters of necessity was a respectable Christian, let alone a Calvinist. Dana made quite specific the identification of Edwards with the Deists in a letter to Andrew Eliot:

> A report is circulated, that the english impression of M^r^ Edwards on the will was promoted by the *deists* in London; and that the *rakes* in Holland had procured a dutch translation of it. If either of these can be authenticated, I should be glad to be inform'd — and particularly obliged to you to send me the information. The friends of M^r^ Edwards pique themselves much on the supposed reputation of his book in England & Scotland. If deists & rakes are

[7] James Dana, An Examination of the Late Reverend President Edwards's "Enquiry on Freedom of Will" (Boston, 1770), ix.

[8] Dana, Examination Continued, 37.

[9] Edwards, Works, II, 140–142.

the persons there by whom it is had in estimation, it might serve the cause of truth to let this be published.[10]

The issue, then, was not the basis for the division between New England Arminians and most New England Calvinists. And whatever Edwards may have thought, it was not even the real basis for the division between him and the Arminians. At the bottom of a tangle of verbal misunderstandings, the analyses of the mind made by Edwards and his opponents were not very different. There are certain elementary distinctions in human experience, such as that between the action of a man and of a clock, and between the failure to act which means that a man is physically prevented from acting and the failure to act which means that he does not want to act. Though one would never guess it from the accusations made on both sides, these distinctions were recognized by both parties. The controversy did more to confuse than it did to clarify the real issue that separated Calvinist and Arminian. For the historian, it is a blind alley, which must be explored only because so many good people lost their way in it.

When Edwards published his treatise, no New England Arminian had written extensively on the freedom of the will. The Arminian position was revealed only in casual and uncritical comments. Thus Chauncy declared, "As Men are *rational, free Agents*, they can't be *religious* but with the *free Consent of their Wills*; and this can be gain'd in no Way, but that of *Reason* and *Persuasion*." [11] Samuel Osborn said that God's making men moral agents is a fruit of His goodness, and "it cannot be tho't (without an Absurdity) that *he should see better afterwards, and deprive Men of their Agency, and work upon them as Machines*." [12] But Chauncy dismissed the whole question in very characteristic fashion:

the *Divine* SPIRIT acts in, and upon them, in a way suited to their nature *as Men*, in a way that agrees with their character as *moral agents*. . . . But to

[10] James Dana to Andrew Eliot, July 9, 1773. MS., Massachusetts Historical Society.

[11] Charles Chauncy, The Only Compulsion Proper to be Made Use of in the Affairs of Conscience and Religion (Boston, 1739), 10.

[12] Samuel Osborn, The Case and Complaint of Mr. Samuel Osborn (Boston, 1743), 10.

say *precisely* how the HOLY GHOST enlightens the *mind*, and then captivates the *will*, . . . these things, I say, are difficulties in this dispensation of grace: And as they are such, the less we puzzle our selves or others about them, the better.[13]

For a knowledge of the Arminian position, then, it is necessary to turn to the English books which were regarded in Massachusetts as having authority. Three authors stand out: John Locke, Daniel Whitby, and Samuel Clarke. Locke's comments may be found in the chapter "Of Power" in the Essay Concerning Human Understanding. The first assertion is that man is an agent; that is, a being which can begin or end its actions in accordance with the preference of the mind. The mind has two powers, the understanding and the will, which may be termed faculties, if we are not misled thereby into supposing each faculty to be an agent, with its own province and authority. The will is the power of choosing between one course of action and another. What determines the will? or, more precisely, what causes a man to choose one action rather than another? Certainly not the greatest positive good, because sometimes a man will act contrary to his best interests, even when he knows what they are. But all men choose that which, at the moment, they feel will be conducive to their happiness. The will, then, is determined by what Locke called "the most pressing uneasiness." Since the will is a power, and not an agent, the word "liberty" is unintelligible when applied to it:

For to ask, whether a man be at liberty to will either motion or rest, speaking or silence, which he pleases, is to ask, whether a man can will what he wills, or be pleased with what he is pleased with. A question which, I think, needs no answer: and they who can make a question of it, must suppose one will to determine the acts of another, and another to determine that; and so on *in infinitum*.[14]

The real question is not whether the will is free, but whether the man is free. The only sensible reply is, that a man is free when he is able to do what he pleases; that is, when his voluntary actions are not thwarted by some external obstacle.

In saying that men choose that which they feel will be con-

[13] Charles Chauncy, The Out-Pouring of the Holy Ghost (Boston, 1742), 19.

[14] John Locke, Essay Concerning Human Understanding, Book II, Chapter 21, paragraph 25.

ducive to their happiness, Locke recognized that the emotions might dominate the reason. But to guard against the notion that men act entirely on impulse, he ended by pointing out that man is a rational creature, which does not always rush to the satisfaction of its immediate desires, but which may stop to consider. Locke did not put it in so many words, but his meaning seems to be that, presented with a course of action, the "most pressing uneasiness" of a rational creature will not be to pursue it without consideration, but rather to examine and pass judgment on it. It is the mind which suspends the immediate satisfaction of desires, however, and not the will. "This seems to me the source of all liberty; in this seems to consist that which is (as I think improperly) called *free-will*." [15]

Locke denied in strict fact the freedom of the will; Daniel Whitby insisted on it. But clearly, the two men were not talking about the same thing. Whitby said quite specifically that "what makes the Will chuse, is something approved by the Understanding, and consequently appearing to the Soul as Good. . . ."

> Wherefore to say that Evidence proposed, apprehended and consider'd, is not sufficient to make the Understanding to approve; or that the greatest Good proposed, the greatest Evil threatned, when equally believed and reflected on, is not sufficient to engage the Will to chuse the Good and refuse the Evil, is in effect to say that which alone doth move the Will to chuse or to refuse, is not sufficient to engage it so to do; . . . which being contradictory to itself, must of necessity be false.[16]

The freedom that concerned Whitby was men's freedom from any irresistible bias of the mind to good or evil: "from Necessity, or a Determination to one, *i.e.* either to Good or Evil only." [17] In other words, his whole argument refers solely to the question of original sin and total depravity. If men are naturally endowed with a corrupt bias, then their evil acts are beyond their control, and they can no more be blamed for them, than a blind man can be blamed for failing to see.

Whitby began by saying that men are in a state of trial or

[15] Locke, Essay, Book II, Chapter 21, paragraph 47.

[16] Daniel Whitby, A Discourse Concerning I. The True Import of the Words Election and Reprobation [etc.], Second edition (London, 1735), 212.

[17] Whitby, Discourse, 344.

probation. The problem is "whether he hath a Freedom to chuse Life or Death, . . . or whether he be determined to one, having a Freedom from Coaction, but not from Necessity." Such liberty is no perfection of human nature, but an admission that men are not perfect. This liberty is not essential "to Man as Man, but only necessary to Man placed in a State of Trial, and under the power of Temptation." [18] God and the angels do not possess freedom in this sense; but they are not rightly rewardable. This freedom from necessity to do evil because of the sin of Adam is essential to a system of rewards and punishments; and it implies a rational being that can consult and deliberate about its course of action. Whitby did deny that men always act in accord with the highest motive; but he was not using the word in the sense that Edwards afterwards did. All he meant was that men do not always follow the strongest rational motive, but sometimes yield to impulse contrary to the dictates of reason.

Samuel Clarke's argument may be found in the Boyle Lectures on the being and attributes of God. Its essentials are very simple. God is an agent — that is, a being with a power of beginning motion — and He has created finite agents. When Clarke said that God is a free moral agent, he was opposing Spinoza, for whom all existence was a gigantic system of logical necessity, which in no particulars could possibly have been other than it is. In actual fact, said Clarke, "all things in the World appear plainly to be the most *Arbitrary* that can be imagined; and to be wholly the Effects, not of *Necessity* but of Wisdom and Choice." True enough, the Supreme Cause must necessarily do what is best. But this is "a Necessity, not of Nature and Fate, but of Fitness and Wisdom; a Necessity, consistent with the greatest Freedom and most perfect Choice." [19] To deny that God is an agent would be to deny that He is the first cause, a sufficiently absurd proposition which would leave no explanation for the existence of the universe.

When Clarke declared that man also is a free moral agent, he

[18] Whitby, Discourse, 299, 300.

[19] Samuel Clarke, A Demonstration of the Being and Attributes of God, Fifth edition (London, 1719), 68, 70.

was opposing materialistic theories like that of Hobbes, which interpreted thinking and willing to be qualities of matter, and regarded men's thoughts and actions in consequence as part of the chain of cause and effect which prevails in the physical world. Whether the will is the seat of men's liberty, Clarke said, is not the question; "but whether there be *at all* in Man any such Power as a Liberty of Choice and of Determining his own Actions; or on the contrary his Actions be all as Necessary, as the Motions of a Clock." [20] He did not deny — in fact, he specifically asserted — that the will is determined by the last judgment of the understanding. But this acts as a moral motive, not as a physical efficient.

> The *Necessity* therefore, by which the *Power of Acting* follows the *Judgment of the Understanding*, is only a *Moral Necessity*, that is, *no Necessity at all*, in the Sense the Opposers of Liberty understand *Necessity*. For *Moral Necessity* is evidently consistent with the most perfect *Natural Liberty*.[21]

Clarke concluded by pointing out that God's foreknowledge is not inconsistent with liberty of men's actions. A man, who has no control over another person's actions, can very often foresee what that person is going to do. God has the same power to a perfect degree. Since foreknowledge "implies no other Certainty, but only That Certainty of Event which the Thing would equally have without being Fore-known, 'tis evident that *It* also implies no necessity." [22] In all this discussion, Clarke evidently does not differ in essentials from Locke and Whitby.

No philosopher influenced Edwards more than John Locke, especially in his treatment of the will. The analysis of the two men is basically the same, though Edwards used a different terminology, and was able to clear up some inconsistencies in Locke's statement. Instead of saying that the will is determined by "the most pressing uneasiness," Edwards said that it is determined by "the strongest motive." He meant by this that a man will do that which appears to him at a given moment to be most desirable, whether for rational reasons or not. The will chooses the greatest apparent good; and since this connection is inseparable, Edwards often phrased his position: "the

[20] Clarke, Demonstration, 91. [21] Ibid., 105. [22] Ibid., 111.

Will is as the greatest apparent good is." This is a doctrine of moral necessity which leads directly to Locke's definition of liberty as the power of a man to do as he pleases. Freedom rests in the absence of external compulsion, rather than in any supposed power men have to choose what they will choose.

According to Edwards, the Arminian notion of liberty involved three points:

> 1. That it consists in a self-determining power in the will, or a certain sovereignty the will has over itself, and its own acts, whereby it determines its own volitions; so as not to be dependent in its determinations, on any cause without itself, nor determined by any thing prior to its own acts. 2. Indifference belongs to Liberty in their notion of it, or that the mind, previous to the act of volition, be in equilibrio. 3. Contingence is another thing that belongs and is essential to it; not in the common acceptance of the word, as that has been already explained, but as opposed to all necessity, or any fixed and certain connection with some previous ground or reason of its existence. They suppose the essence of Liberty so much to consist in these things, that unless the will of man be free in this sense, he has no real freedom, how much soever he may be at Liberty to act according to his will.[23]

But if Locke, Whitby, and Clarke may be accepted as typical Arminians, it is surely clear that Edwards's analysis of volition was the same as the Arminian analysis, and he was accusing them of holding views which in fact they rejected. It was the soundest of Arminian doctrine to say that men choose that which appears to them most agreeable, and to deny that the will is self-determined. The Arminians did insist that God and men are agents; but Edwards's own position involves the same assumption, though it tends toward occasionalism. They did declare, in opposition to materialists, that man's will is not bound by any system of physical necessity; but they acknowledged that it is determined by moral necessity. Completely misunderstanding the Arminian position, when Edwards read Whitby and Clarke, and actually found they agreed with him, he accused them of being inconsistent with themselves.[24]

The essential identity of Edwards and the Arminians on this fundamental point cannot be too firmly emphasized, since most students know of the Arminians only through Edwards's misdirected attack on them. Readers of the Freedom of the Will

[23] Edwards, Works, II, 18, 19.

[24] Ibid., 48–52.

are so fascinated by the vigorous way that Edwards demolished the "Arminian" position that they do not stop to inquire whether he was representing his opponents fairly or not. But if the Arminians did not believe in a self-determining power of the will, or that actions proceed from a state of equilibrium or indifference, where did Edwards get the curious notion that they did? The answer is an ironic one. It was from an anonymous book which was not by an Arminian at all, but by a Calvinist — a moderate Calvinist, to be sure, but still a Calvinist. The book was An Essay on the Freedom of Will in God and in Creatures. It was published at London in 1732, and its author was Isaac Watts.

Against this volume, Edwards's attack could be quite legitimately directed. Watts believed that it is the will "that is properly the moral principle or agent within us, the proper subject of virtue or vice, and therefore it must be a free and self-determining power, and must chuse of itself, whether it will follow reason or appetite, judgment or passion." [25] To be sure, the understanding, which perceives the fitness or unfitness of things, often serves as a "director or guide" to the will. But the will remains sovereign, not necessarily determined by the greatest apparent good as it is discovered to the mind, or the last dictate of the understanding, or the removal of some uneasiness. That the greatest apparent good, as Watts understood the phrase, does not determine the will, is shown by the fact that many persons are convinced that piety and virtue will conduce to their happiness, yet their will chooses present sensualities and vicious pleasures. The will has power over the understanding to the extent that if it has an inclination to an object, it yields to the prejudices on one side, "it fixes the mind upon those arguments, which tend to prove what it wishes, and turns the thoughts away from those evidences, which lie on the other side of the question," and so influences the judgment.[26] It may also rush the mind to a hasty and ill-advised decision, based on slight and insufficient evidence. A further mark of the

[25] Isaac Watts, "An Essay on the Freedom of Will in God and in Creatures," in Discourses, Essays, and Tracts, on Various Subjects (London, 1753), VI, 386.

[26] Watts, Discourses, VI, 379.

self-determining power of the will is its action when confronted with identical alternatives. Suppose that a man is shown two cakes, or two eggs exactly alike. Neither appears more desirable than the other, yet the man can choose one and reject the other. "The understanding in such instances as these, has no pretence of power to direct or determine the will, because it sees no superior fitness, and the will would be for ever undetermined, if it did not determine itself." [27] This argument of Watts was not based on any serious misunderstanding of his opponents. He was able to summarize succinctly the contrary view: "that the will of man in every action whatsoever is certainly and necessarily determined by the last dictate or judgment of the understanding, and that the understanding is necessarily determined in it's judgment by present appearances of things as to their fitness or unfitness. . . ." [28] But he rejected this as leaving no freedom of choice to man, encouraging the principles of fatalists, and taking away the true distinction between virtue and vice.

If Edwards and the Arminians agreed that men's actions are governed by moral necessity — that is, by a necessary connection between acts of the will and the greatest apparent good — what explains all the excitement in New England pulpits? Why did New England Arminians attack Edwards's treatise? In the first place, there was a great deal of misunderstanding of Edwards resulting from different use of terms. In the second place, Edwards's opponents were by no means his intellectual equals, and were prone to lose their way in the thicket of debate. Edwards had produced what purported to be a refutation of the Arminian position, so the Arminians felt they must attack it. But they sometimes fell into the pitfall of accepting his statement of their position as correct, or else they failed to distinguish between those parts of his treatise with which they agreed and those which they rejected. They were certain that Edwards's conclusions were false, but they were not quite clear at what point to press the attack. Their argument then requires some interpretation to distinguish between what they said and what they meant.

The real difficulty was that Edwards combined moral neces-

[27] Watts, Discourses, VI, 388. [28] Ibid., 393.

sity with total depravity. He said that men have inherited a corrupt bias, so that no matter what object or inducement to action is placed before them, their actions will be vicious. This meant, according to the Arminians, that in the last analysis a man's vicious actions are not the result of moral necessity, but of physical necessity. If a man sins because he has inherited a sinful nature, this is a matter over which he has no control; it is a result of his inheritance just as much as his physical endowment, and so he cannot be blamed, no matter how vicious his acts. The whole controversy would have been vastly simplified if the Arminians had recognized clearly that Edwards's treatise was not wrong, but irrelevant. They should have dismissed the Freedom of the Will, and concentrated on the treatise on Original Sin which complemented it. Moral necessity without total depravity loses all its sting. Arminians like James Dana saw this, but not as clearly as one might wish. Their reply to Edwards was blunted in consequence.

For a decade and a half following the publication of Edwards's book, there was no careful reply to it. Arminians often asserted man's free moral agency; but their comments were loose and ambiguous. Henry Cumings of Billerica was heard to say that in his opinion Edwards's treatise was little better than fatalism, and that if he were an atheist he would want no better arguments than he found there to support his position.[29] Condemnation of the book as fatalistic was more common than analysis of its argument. In a volume of sermons published in 1755, Jonathan Mayhew did devote a long footnote to the question; but he regarded it as a fruitless undertaking: "if we *exercise ourselves in these things*, I know of no valuable end it can answer — except that of convincing us of our ignorance. . . ." [30] The most he would say was that some men choose to conform to the Holy Spirit, and others do not. A careful reading of the footnote, however, reveals plainly the kind of necessity he was opposing:

> if the sinner . . . could not possibly have avoided thus *willing*, *chusing*, and acting; but was, in every successive moment of his existence, even from the

[29] William B. Sprague, Annals of the American Unitarian Pulpit (New York, 1865), 60.

[30] Jonathan Mayhew, Sermons . . . On Hearing the Word [etc.] (Boston, 1755), 291.

first, laid under a necessity of doing just as he did; whether this were owing to any *external* constraint, or to some *internal, original* byass, or impulse of *nature*; makes not the least alteration in the case, so far as divine justice is concerned in it.[31]

Here the necessity is two-fold: physical necessity of external compulsion; and the necessity that comes from inherited bias, equally beyond the control of the individual. Nothing is said in opposition to that moral necessity which connects acts of the will with the greatest apparent good. Mayhew adopted three arguments for the essential liberty of moral agents: first, men's consciousness of it; second, Clarke's argument that there must somewhere be an agent which is the first cause, and the creator of finite agents; and third, the moral sense of men, who have no difficulty in distinguishing those acts for which they may be blamed from those beyond their control.

Charles Chauncy, like Mayhew, replied to Edwards briefly and incidentally, in The Benevolence of the Deity. Chauncy had read Archbishop King's Origin of Evil, and had borrowed from it extensively in writing his own book. But the significant fact is that Chauncy remained wholly unaffected by King's theory of the freedom of the will. King had argued that an agent is pleased with what he chooses, rather than chooses what pleases him. He denied that the will is determined by "any *Uneasiness* arising from the things about which it is conversant." The will is indifferent to external objects. "These Objects then will neither please nor displease till this Indifference be removed, but it is suppos'd to be removed by the Application or Determination of the Power itself; therefor Anxiety does not produce but presuppose its Determination." [32] This position resembles Watts's more than it does Locke's; and indeed, Watts acknowledged that King's book had been the inspiration for his own.[33] But Chauncy, despite his indebtedness to King on other points, reverted to the standard interpretation of the freedom of the will as it had been developed by Locke,

[31] Mayhew, Sermons On Hearing the Word, 302n.

[32] William King, An Essay on the Origin of Evil. Translated with notes by Edmund Law. First English edition. (London, 1731), Chap. V, Sec. 1, Subsec. 3, Par. VI.

[33] Watts, Discourses, VI, 384.

Whitby, and Clarke. First of all he established that man is an agent. Then, without discussing whether the highest motive determines the will, he set out to prove that man has a power "to direct, suspend, over-rule, or put an intire stop to" his volitions.[34] Men's rational powers may control their impulses; hence men are "self-determined."

Two Arminians, however, made full-dress replies to Edwards: James Dana of Wallingford, Connecticut, and Samuel West of New Bedford. Dana was the author of An Examination of the Late President Edwards's "Enquiry on Freedom of Will" which was published in 1770, and of a continuation which appeared three years later. At the time of his ordination in 1758, he had been charged by the Calvinists with heterodoxy. Since the debate was quickly diverted to questions of polity, it is hard to say how much of an Arminian he was at that time. His two examinations of Edwards do not reveal a very extreme or outspoken form of Arminianism, but they make it clear that he was no Calvinist. Samuel West's first three Essays on Liberty and Necessity were not published until 1793; but as he explained in the preliminary Advertisement, they had been composed twenty years earlier. They were reprinted in 1795, with a continuation.

The primary assumption of both Dana and West was that man is an agent, a being endowed with a mind, which can initiate motion in the physical world. God is an infinite agent, who must be presumed to have the power of creating finite agents.[35] The volitions of a moral agent do not emerge from nothing: "a moral effect cannot exist without a cause any more than a natural effect. . . ." [36] But the important fact is that man is not a machine; his volitions are determined by moral and not physical causes.

Motives, said Edwards, are the cause of volitions. Here, in the use of the words "motive" and "cause" was a fruitful source of misunderstanding. Dana defined motive as follows: "By motives we mean external reasons or inducements ex-

[34] Charles Chauncy, The Benevolence of the Deity (Boston, 1784), 132. Although not published until 1784, this book was written prior to 1768.

[35] Dana, Examination, 93n. [36] Dana, Examination Continued, 33.

hibited to the view of a moral agent." [37] Indeed, he sometimes restricted the word even more, to include only rational motives:

> Virtuous or vicious elections must proceed upon motive. And we grant that the greatest good really *ought* to determine moral agents; but that it always *doth*, even where it is perceived, we deny. . . . 'Tis too common, indeed, that the passions bias and pervert the moral judgment. . . . Moral agents many times sin immediately against present light and conviction, while they have *full in their view* the wiser choice. And what is this, but to determine themselves contrary to the greatest apparent good? [38]

Samuel West's definition was similar:

> By motive, we understand the occasion, reason, end, or design, which an agent has in view, when he acts; therefore, we say, that the mind acts upon motives; i.e. when the mind acts or chooses, it always has some end, design, or reason, which is the occasion of its acting, or choosing; therefore, motives, in our sense of the term, are the previous circumstances, which are necessary for action.[39]

But Edwards meant much more than this. Three factors were involved in his use of the word. First, there is an external object or inducement to action. Secondly, that object or inducement results in action only insofar as the mind regards it with desire or distaste — a motive is not really external, since it is not the object itself, but the object as viewed by the mind. In the third place, the object is apprehended as desirable or distasteful, not by the reason alone, but by the emotions as well: "the understanding must be taken in a large sense, as including the whole faculty of perception or apprehension, and not merely what is called reason or judgment." [40] The Arminians, then, conceived of a motive as something external to the mind: an object, reason, or inducement to action. Edwards conceived of it as internal: an object or inducement as viewed by the mind with favor or disfavor.

The word "cause" was used by Edwards in a broad sense to include both the efficient cause and the occasion of an action. "The word is often used," he acknowledged, "in so restrained a sense as to signify only that which has a positive efficiency or influence to produce a thing, or bring it to pass." But there are often circumstances associated with an effect which are not

[37] Ibid., 31.
[38] Ibid., 38, 39.
[39] Samuel West, Essays on Liberty and Necessity (New Bedford, 1795), Part I, 16.
[40] Edwards, Works, II, 8.

truly its efficient cause. "And in agreeableness to this, I sometimes use the word Effect for the consequence of another thing, which is perhaps rather an occasion than a Cause, most properly speaking." [41] The Arminians meant by cause an efficient cause. An external object, or inducement, may be the occasion of a volition; but it is the agent which is the efficient cause. West put it in these words:

> Now, by *cause* I understand that which produces an effect; i.e. an efficient: and, by an *efficient*, I understand an agent; and, by an *agent*, I understand a mind: For I have no idea, that any thing can properly deserve the name of an agent, i.e. of an active being, but only a mind.[42]

A moral event must have a moral cause: "And whether any other than an *intelligent mind* can be such a cause, let those who have common understanding judge." [43] This problem concerned West more than it did Dana, but Dana several times inquired, "Wherein consists the *energy* of motive?" — a question to which Edwards, using the words in a different sense, gave no reply.

When Edwards said that motives are the cause of volitions, the Arminians thought to themselves: "Motives — that means an external object or inducement; cause — that means an efficient cause. This is physical necessity! We must assert that man is self-determined; for physical necessity leads to fatalism." But when they declared that "motives are the occasion of volitions, and man as an agent is the cause of his volitions," they did not realize that their difference from Edwards was one of terminology.

Samuel West carried his analysis of the will no farther than this. Most of his small volume is concerned with other related problems, such as the connection between foreknowledge and necessity, and whether necessity makes God the author of sin. But Dana showed more penetration. He agreed willingly that "there can be no act of choice without some motive or inducement." [44] The crucial question, however, is whether, in Edwards's language, men always act in accordance with the highest motive. "It must be allowed, that if the volitions of moral

[41] Edwards, Works, II, 26.
[42] West, Essays, Part I, 10.
[43] Dana, Examination, 81, 82.
[44] Ibid., 109.

agents *always* are *as the greatest apparent good is*, this amounts to a proof of necessity in the *philosophic* sense of the words." Here Dana ran into difficulties, and gave inconsistent replies. He admitted that "motives may, *in some cases*, be exhibited in so strong a light, that the mind in which they are extant could not but make the choice it doth. . . ." But, he continued, "unless this can be shewn to hold true in *every* instance, the doctrine of necessary determination cannot be supported." [45] The logic of his own argument and all experience told him that the will is as the greatest apparent good. But the Scripture told him that Adam and the rebellious angels had fallen. Since Adam and the angels had been created perfect, the greatest apparent good for them must have coincided with the real good. How, then, could they possibly have sinned? In this conflict between reason and revelation, Dana had to accept the Scripture; and on the strength of these two exceptions to the general rule of moral necessity, he postulated a freedom of the will.[46] But even here, he was not certain of his own ground. The trend of Arminian thought was to deny that Adam was perfect — to declare that, like his posterity, he came upon the earth with mere naked capacities, which had to be trained up to righteousness. And so Dana himself gave the Arminian answer to his own objections:

> Man, therefore, had at first such powers and communications from God as were sufficient to his continuing and improving in the knowledge, in the moral resemblance and enjoyment of his maker. His original sin appears to have been a neglect of reason and hasty listning to the sollicitations of appetite.[47]

A little careful study, which would have cleared Dana's position of inconsistencies and ambiguities, might have led to complete agreement with Edwards on the narrow question of the analysis of the mind. The real issue then might have come into focus. But Dana did touch the heart of the matter, on the very first page of his Examination: "The enquiry in this place is not, Whether the highest motive hath always a causal influence on the will? But, admitting this to be the case, what it is that *causeth* any supposed motive to *be* the highest in the mind's

[45] Dana, Examination Continued, 36.
[46] Dana, Examination, 11; Examination Continued, 36.
[47] Dana, Examination Continued, 24.

view?" [48] He repeated the question in other words: "*How* comes the object to have such a particular *appearance* to the mind? . . . *Whence* is the *state*, *temper*, or *frame* of the mind what it is?" [49] Obviously, two factors are involved, the external object or motive itself, and the observing mind:

> . . . *antecedent* to the mind's view of the object, there must be something in it [the object] to cause it to appear agreable when viewed — something independent on, and prior to the view — or the mind must be in such a particular state, frame, or temper — or view the object under such and such circumstances, in order to it's appearing thus and thus agreable.[50]

That one or the other of these factors is finally responsible for the determination of the will is certain: "Either internal, original bias, or something extrinsic, is the cause, to whose efficiency, determination, command, decision, the will is as much subject, as the motion of the body to the will. . . ." [51]

Dana was not quite sure on which of these factors Edwards rested his case, though Edwards declared plainly that both of them are involved.[52] To be doubly sure, Dana examined both alternatives. If Edwards meant that the will is determined by an extrinsic cause — that is, the nature of the object itself — then sinful volitions are not the fault of the individual, but must be charged to God Himself. The object is a motive to choice. "But motives to choice are exhibited to their mind by some agent: By whom are they exhibited?" There is no stop in tracing the causal relationship until we reach the first cause. "Will it now be said, that GOD is the cause of those dispositions of heart, and acts of the will, which are so odious in their own nature? On Mr. *Edwards*'s scheme this must be said." [53]

The remaining alternative, that the mind is determined by an "original bias or propensity," raises the question of total depravity which was really the crux of the whole dispute. Consider Adam and Eve in their innocency:

> *Their* original bias and inclination, it will be allowed, proceeded immediately from the creator. If then their sin was the effect of a necessity originally in their will, or was their will's original propensity, it was so entirely owing to

[48] Dana, Examination, 1.
[49] Ibid., 3.
[50] Ibid., 23.
[51] Ibid., 44, 45.
[52] Edwards, Works, II, 6–8.
[53] Dana, Examination, 49.

the *nature of things*, that (by supposition) it could not involve them in guilt — Or if connected with the eternal cause, who alone is necessary in his own nature, it could not upon our author's own scheme; be *their* sin. The whole guilt, if any, must be imputed to the first cause.[54]

The true nature of the Arminian protest against Edwards now becomes apparent. The objection was not against moral necessity, but against moral necessity combined with total depravity. For total depravity, involving as it did a man's inheritance, doomed him to sin quite as inescapably as though he were bound by physical necessity. It was really a kind of physical necessity. Edwards's argument, therefore, based on the distinction between natural and moral inability, fell to the ground. "The moral faculty, or power, which Mr. *Edwards* saith belongs to moral agency, is a natural faculty or power. So that whatever moral capacity or incapacity is attributed to mankind, the same is natural." [55]

Since God created men's natures, and gave them their moral capacity or incapacity, Edwards's scheme made God the author of sin. "The examiner begs the reader to keep in mind this single question, *Whether Mr. Edwards's doctrine makes God the efficient cause of all moral wickedness?* . . . To reduce a *Christian* writer to this is sufficient, without going any further." [56] Dana was hardly being unfair to Edwards in charging that such was the outcome of his system. The Edwardeans did object to the bald way in which the Arminians stated their position, and much preferred to say that God ordained a system in which sin would infallibly come to pass. But however one phrased it, the effect was the same. The Edwardeans were forced to prove that sin was desirable. Samuel Hopkins published Sin, Through Divine Interposition, an Advantage to the Universe (1758); and Joseph Bellamy wrote Four Sermons on the Wisdom of God in the Permission of Sin (1758), and The Wisdom of God in the Permission of Sin, Vindicated (1759). Such an inversion of moral values was incredible to the Arminian. Dana agreed with Bishop Butler that God may bring good out of moral evil; but it still would have been far better if the evil had never existed. To argue that moral evil is an advantage, is to say that the di-

[54] Ibid., 53, 54. [55] Ibid., 81. [56] Dana, Examination Continued, vi.

vine law of righteousness is imperfect, and leaves no basis from which to condemn intemperance and all debauchery. Besides, if God ordains sin, "How then is sin such an *infinite evil* as we have been taught to believe it? Does it not turn out an infinite *good?*" [57]

To say that GOD chose it, and determined the will of the creature to it, is impious, even supposing it is in fact followed with greater good, than otherwise would have been — which supposition is, however, but meer conjecture at best, and without any solid foundation.[58]

The alternatives seemed clear. Either God was the cause of men's sinful volitions, by presenting them with motives to evil or creating in them a sinful nature, or else men themselves were the cause. If men are responsible for their own volitions, then they must be free. A moral agent is free, not in the sense that he does not choose the greatest apparent good, but in Daniel Whitby's sense, that he is not depraved, or determined by an inherited bias of the mind to good or evil. Edwards said that men sin because they are by nature sinful creatures. Dana was arguing that men are not sinful creatures, but *rational* ones, whose moral character depends on their education, training, and the other circumstances of their lives. God has bestowed on men rational powers which enable them to judge of what is right and wrong. This is what distinguishes men from animals and idiots, and makes them accountable moral agents, who may be justly praised or blamed. Men can determine the reasonableness or unreasonableness of any proposed object of choice; they can suspend action until they have had a chance to consider. Indeed, as rational agents, they are the kind of creatures who will choose to suspend action:

A power of suspending election and action is plainly a power of determining whether we will be governed by reason and the principles of religion, or not. And can this power be allowed to moral agents consistently with the denial of self-determination? [59]

Doubtless Dana's terminology was confusing. The Calvinists commonly referred to the will when they used the word "self-determination." But the Arminians always meant that man

[57] Dana, Examination, 12.

[58] Ibid., 75.

[59] Dana, Examination Continued, 20, 21.

himself is self-determined; that he is, in the sense already explained, a rational moral agent.

By and large, the problem of the freedom of the will seemed less important to the Arminians than it did to Edwards. Most of the time, they appealed to experience and let it go at that. "Let a man look into his own breast," wrote Dana, "and he cannot but perceive inward freedom — *Inward freedom* — For if freedom be not in the *mind*, it is no where. And liberty in the mind implies *self-determination*." [60] For however one phrased it, the Arminians were convinced that moral agents are free to respond to the monitions of conscience and the dictates of reason.

[60] Dana, Examination, v.

THE EPISODE OF THE ROMAN STANDARDS AT JERUSALEM

CARL H. KRAELING
YALE UNIVERSITY

ONE of the great handicaps confronting the student of Christian origins is the paucity of specific information about Palestine in the period of Jesus and the early Church. The student can learn much that has an indirect bearing upon Palestine by acquainting himself with the history and antiquities of Syria, Transjordan and Egypt. He can obtain an adequate picture of the general course of events in Palestine itself from Josephus, and can recreate the outlines of its changing scene and changing conditions by piecing together many bits of unrelated information from earlier and later periods. But when it comes to strictly contemporary Palestinian remains and specific contemporary Palestinian events, he has to admit that his knowledge is regrettably limited and fragmentary. The cities, the towns, the public buildings, the private houses and their household effects in the Palestine of the days of Jesus and his apostles are known only imperfectly and vaguely, in the main from literary sources. The complete excavation of even one site with datable contemporary strata would clarify the picture tremendously.[1] For a knowledge of contemporary events our most productive source is still Josephus, and from the all-important procuratorship of Pontius Pilate, 26–36 A.D., Josephus has only three episodes to narrate. They are the episode of the standards, the episode of the new aqueduct, and the episode of the sacred vessels supposedly buried on Mt. Gerizim. Because of the paucity of the information available from the period, each of these episodes deserves careful study, that the events themselves may be clearly understood and their possible bearing upon Gospel story duly appraised. In this sense I propose to deal here with the episode of the Roman standards at Jerusalem.

[1] Such strata should exist at Pella, Sepphoris and Bethsaida-Julias, but save in the case of the first-mentioned the obstacles to their excavation are still insurmountable.

The episode of the standards appears in both the Bellum (II, 9, 2–3 = §§ 169–174 ed. Naber) and the Antiquitates (XVIII, 3, 1 = §§ 55–59). In the Bellum form, as translated by Thackeray, the narrative reads as follows:

> Pilate, being sent by Tiberius as procurator to Judaea, introduced into Jerusalem by night and under cover the effigies of Caesar which are called standards. This proceeding, when day broke, aroused immense excitement among the Jews; those on the spot were in consternation, considering their laws to have been trampled under foot, as those laws permit no image to be erected in the city, while the indignation of the townspeople stirred the countryfolk, who flocked together in crowds. Hastening after Pilate to Caesarea, the Jews implored him to remove the standards from Jerusalem and to uphold the laws of their ancestors. When Pilate refused, they fell prostrate around his house and for five whole days and nights remained motionless in that position.
>
> On the ensuing day Pilate took his seat on his tribunal in the great stadium and summoning the multitude, with the apparent intention of answering them, gave the arranged signal to his armed soldiers to surround the Jews. Finding themselves in a ring of troops, three deep, the Jews were struck dumb at this unexpected sight. Pilate after threatening to cut them down, if they refused to admit Caesar's images, signalled to the soldiers to draw their swords. Thereupon the Jews, as by concerted action, flung themselves in a body on the ground, extended their necks, and exclaimed that they were ready rather to die than to transgress the law. Overcome with astonishment at such intense religious zeal, Pilate gave orders for the immediate removal of the standards from Jerusalem.

The parallel account in the Antiquitates has a few details of value to add to our knowledge of the episode. It indicates that the occasion of the unfortunate developments was the transfer of a force (*στρατιά*) from Caesarea to winter quarters at Jerusalem, and clarifies the nature of the images objected to by stating that they were busts attached to the standards (*προτομὰς Καίσαρος αἳ ταῖς σημαίαις προσῆσαν*). Referring back to previous practice, it declares that because of the prohibition against images contained in Jewish law "the procurators of earlier days were wont to make entry into the city only with (or: for) standards lacking such ornaments" (*οἱ πρότερον ἡγεμόνες ταῖς μὴ μετὰ τοιῶνδε κόσμων σημαίαις ἐποιοῦντο εἴσοδον τῇ πόλει*), Pilate being the first to depart from this custom. To these valuable bits of supplementary information the later account adds that Pilate found the Jews' petition unacceptable because it involved the threat of offense against the person of the Em-

peror (διὰ τὸ εἰς ὕβριν Καίσαρι φέρειν). Whatever he may have said, Pilate, by acceding to the Jews' request, ultimately ruled that no offense against the Lex Julia had been committed. The Antiquitates declare, finally, that the motive behind the innovation was the procurator's intent to overthrow the Jewish statutes (ἐπὶ καταλύσει τῶν νομίμων τῶν Ἰουδαϊκῶν ἐφρόνησε). As a dominant motive this is quite improbable for it conflicts much too violently with the basic principles of Roman provincial administration, principles that Pilate could not but have known. No matter what his personal disrespect for Jewish law, it is much more probable that Pilate's course of action was determined by thoroughly practical considerations.

One thing must be made clear at the outset in any attempt to interpret the episode of the standards, namely, that while the Romans did not differentiate as sharply as we do between the authority of civil and military officials in the command of troops, civil officials such as procurators were scarcely in a position to prescribe to a military unit what standards it might or might not bear at a given time or place. Standards served various purposes. Some of them were the instruments of military tactics, others identified the unit or expressed its allegiance to the state and its religion. All of them were in some sense sacred and necessary and consequently not to be changed or left behind at will. When Josephus, therefore, tells us that Pilate introduced into Jerusalem for the first time standards to which busts of the Emperor were attached, he means to say that Pilate dispatched to the city a military unit that regularly carried such standards and one that had not been at the city in the period of the earlier procurators. The same holds true also of the return of the offending standards from Jerusalem to Caesarea. The unit was withdrawn with its standards. This suggests that to gain a proper perspective upon the entire episode and upon Pilate's purposes we should ascertain, first, what is known about the forces stationed in Palestine as a whole and in Jerusalem in particular in the days of the early procurators, and second, which of the units of this force could have borne standards of the type described by Josephus.

The troops stationed in Palestine in Pilate's day were not

legionary "regulars." This much is quite certain. Legionaries appear in Palestine only under special circumstances such as those connected with Herod's death (Bellum II, 3, 1 = § 40), with Gaius' insane plan to revenge the insult done him at Jamnia (Antiquitates XVIII, 8, 2–3 = §§ 261–269), and with the Jewish Revolt, and then always under the command of an imperial legate. Pilate's military force consisted of auxiliary units. Their identity is not directly known but can be inferred with some degree of assurance. For the years of Agrippa's reign (41–44 A.D.) and later the presence of one *ala* and five cohorts *Sebastenorum et Caesariensium* is attested by Josephus (Antiquitates XIX, 9, 2 = § 365). These units apparently formed the basic nucleus of the Palestinian force in the earlier days as well. The reason is that they seem to represent an element (the best element, Josephus says) of the army of Herod the Great that had supported the Roman cause in the days of Sabinus. The element consisted of 3,000 Σεβαστηνοί, and included both infantry and cavalry (Bellum II, 3, 4 = § 52). It seems safe to assume that Archelaus kept the group intact and that when the procurators took over Judaea and Samaria it was reorganized along Roman lines and enrolled among the Roman *auxilia*.[2] Enlarged by the addition of new recruits from Caesarea the group could well have yielded the one *ala* and five cohorts *Sebastenorum et Caesariensium* of the later period.

The writer of the Acts of the Apostles mentions in addition a σπεῖρα καλουμένη Ἰταλική (Acts 10, 1), whose centurion Cornelius Peter baptized. This unit, probably the *cohors II Italica civium Romanorum voluntariorum*,[3] Olmstead has recently designated as the one which took Jesus prisoner on the night in which he was betrayed.[4] That Roman soldiers had anything at all to do with the capture of Jesus is extremely doubtful,[5]

[2] So Schuerer, Geschichte des jüdischen Volkes, etc., Vol. I (5 ed.), 1920, p. 460.

[3] Cf. T. R. S. Broughton in Beginnings of Christianity, ed. Jackson and Lake, Vol. V, 1933, pp. 441–443.

[4] Jesus in the Light of History, 1942, p. 224. Olmstead believes the cohort arrived in Palestine in 6 A.D., when Archelaus was deposed.

[5] It is, of course, the Fourth Gospel which introduces the Romans into the account of Jesus' capture, whereas the Synoptic Gospels mention only the servants of the High Priest, servants whose violence and authority were proverbial (Talmud Babli, Pesachim

but the presence of the *cohors II Italica* (in Caesarea!) in Pilate's day is possible, though the evidence is very weak indeed. We know from Tacitus and the inscriptions that the cohort was in Syria as early as 69 A.D.[6] If the writer of Acts is correct in associating with the unit a convert of Peter's, the probability is that the evidence can be applied safely only to the period after the persecution of the Jerusalem church by Agrippa, in other words to the period after 42–44 A.D.[7] It would be entirely possible to argue that the cohort came to Palestine with Agrippa when he entered the country as *rex socius*. Indeed, its arrival at this time, especially after Agrippa's difficulties in Egypt, would be more readily intelligible than in the days after Archelaus' banishment when things were relatively quiet. The only basis for assuming that the cohort arrived at an earlier time is the description of Cornelius as a man who had associated himself and his household somehow with the Synagogue. That this necessarily implies a lengthy residence on his part in Caesarea or that it is good evidence for the history of the cohort, I doubt very much. Hence I am inclined to regard it as improbable that the *cohors II Italica* was in Palestine in Pilate's day, while admitting that it is possible.[8]

There being, today, no further evidence for the identity of the troops stationed in Palestine in Pilate's day, we turn next to the question of the nature and extent of the normal Jerusalem garrison. Here again we have Josephus and the New Testament to draw upon.

57a). The legendary character of the account in John 18 is revealed not only by the fact that it mobilizes an entire cohort (σπεῖρα) with its tribune (χιλίαρχος), but also by the improbability that even a detachment of the Roman auxiliaries would have delivered its prisoner to the High Priest instead of to the Roman procurator.

[6] Cf. Broughton, loc. cit.

[7] To this period it seems necessary to assign the episodes from Peter's missionary work along the Palestinian sea coast given in Acts 9–11. Cf. K. Lake in Beginnings of Christianity, Vol. V, 1933, p. 468.

[8] I see no justification for reference to this as a "legionary" cohort. Very little is, of course, known about the *cohortes civium Romanorum voluntariorum*, but whether they were composed of slaves who upon enrollment received the rank of freedmen, or whether as in later days they were made up of freeborn citizens seeking an easier berth than that which the legions offered, they are not in any sense "legionary." On these cohorts cf. Kromayer-Veith, Heerwesen u. Kriegführung der Griechen u. Römer, 1928, p. 497.

The evidence from Josephus is clear and consistent. After the death of Herod the Great Varus, the governor of Syria, quartered one of his Syrian legions at Jerusalem to forestall serious outbreaks during the interregnum (Bellum II, 3, 1 = § 40). The legion remained there during the troubled days of Sabinus, and perhaps even after the latter's departure, but must have returned to Syria when Archelaus received Judaea as a tetrarchy, though Josephus does not mention the fact. Aside from the story of the standards under discussion here, the next reference to the garrison of Jerusalem comes in the account of an episode in the procuratorship of Cumanus (48–52 A.D.). The story is that of the Roman soldier who, while guarding the Temple at the Festival of Unleavened Bread, angered the Jews by an indecent gesture (Bellum II, 12, 1 = §§ 223–224). In introducing the story Josephus says:

> A crowd having come together in Jerusalem for the Feast of Unleavened Bread, and the Roman cohort standing guard over the stoa of the Temple (καὶ τῆς Ῥωμαϊκῆς σπείρας ὑπὲρ τὴν τοῦ ἱεροῦ στοὰν ἐφεστώσης . . .), one of the soldiers, etc.

The statement seems to imply that one cohort was the regular garrison of Jerusalem and could thus be referred to as "the Roman cohort." [9] This is confirmed to some extent for the period of Cumanus by the remark of the Antiquitates that in the subsequent troubles in Samaria the procurator moved up four detachments of infantry and one *ala* of cavalry from Caesarea to Samaria.[10] As the total military force in Palestine probably consisted of but five cohorts and one *ala*, the number of detachments mentioned would have been available at Caesarea if one cohort was stationed at Jerusalem.[11]

Acts gives us the same general picture for the procuratorship of Felix (52–60 A.D.). In the story of Paul's last visit to Jerusalem (Acts 21–23, *c.* 56 A.D.), mention is frequently made of

[9] The parallel account of Antiquitates XX, 5, 3 = § 106 neither confirms nor denies this interpretation.

[10] Antiquitates XX, 6, 1 = § 122. The word for the infantry detachments is not σπεῖρα but τάγμα. The latter is, however, used by Josephus not of a *rexillatio*, but of an established formation. In Bellum II, 3, 1 = § 40 it is applied even to a legion. In this instance it will not be incorrect to take it as a synonym of σπεῖρα.

[11] The picture is thoroughly clear even though in the parallel account of the episode (Bellum II, 12 = § 236) Josephus mentions only the *ala*.

a certain Claudius Lysias who seems to be the highest military officer of the city and who, having taken Paul into protective custody, eventually sends him to Felix under guard. Lysias' rank is given as that of *tribunus* (χιλίαρχος), and when in Acts 21, 31 he is first introduced, he is described as χιλίαρχος τῆς σπείρης, that is, apparently, as tribune of the cohort forming the garrison of the city. From the fact that 70 horsemen and 200 δεξιολάβοι are said to have escorted Paul on the way to Caesarea (Acts 23, 23) little else could be concluded than that the cohort of the garrison was a *cohors equitata* rather than *peditata*, or that it had certain *vexillationes* associated with it for special services.[12]

The evidence for the nature and constitution of the Jerusalem garrison as presented applies admittedly to the period after Pilate's tenure of office. Yet it is surprisingly harmonious and the best explanation of the harmony is to suppose that the conditions described were static and hence familiar to all. It would be difficult, therefore, not to assume that in Pilate's day one cohort of from 500 to 1,000 men formed the regular garrison of Jerusalem.

Before venturing to consider which of the several units possibly available in Palestine Pilate may have planned to send into winter quarters at Jerusalem, we must know something about Roman standards, their various forms and the distribution of the different forms among the various services of the army.

The word σημαία used by Josephus in his account of the episode of the standards is, like its Latin equivalent *signum*, a generic term and may apply to any or all of the standards borne by military units, though it is used also in a narrower sense for one particular type. Among the Roman standards the first to be mentioned are the *aquila*, a golden eagle mounted on a pole, and the *imago* or *imagines*, representations of animals or busts of the Emperor similarly mounted.[13] Both types are essentially symbolic and religious in their significance. The *aquila* borne

[12] The meaning of δεξιολάβος and its textual variant δεξιοβόλος is quite uncertain.

[13] On the general subject of standards cf. A. J. Reinach in Daremberg-Saglio, s.v. *signa*; A. v. Domaszewski, Die Fahnen im römischen Heere, Abhandlungen des archäologisch-epigraphischen Seminares der Universität Wien, Vol. V, 1885; and Kromayer-Veith, op. cit., esp. pp. 402 ff., 520 ff.

by the *aquilifer* is the palladium exclusively of the legion. Legions also have *imagines* borne by *imaginiferi*, but they share this type of standard with other troops, the *urbaniciani*, the *vigiles*, the *alae* and the *auxiliarii*. The theriomorphic *imagines*, comprising mainly zodiacal animals, have something to do with the *dies natalis* of the unit. The images of the Emperor, whatever else they may denote, have a religious and cultic significance also. While every established military unit could, and perhaps did, have its own theriomorphic *imago*, it is clear that some units did not have separate representations of the Emperor. What the criterion for the distribution of the imperial likenesses may be, is not yet entirely evident.

The next type of standard to be mentioned is that to which the word *signum* is applied in the narrower sense.[14] More familiar than the others if for no other reason than because of representations in the school texts of Caesar's Gallic Wars, the *signum* consists of a spear decorated just below the spear-head with a cross-bar and fillets, and adorned along the shaft with a series of discs, or wreaths and discs, or wreaths and discs and mural crowns. So far as the discs (*phalerae*) are concerned the *signa* can be divided into two types, those that are aniconic and have smooth, polished surface, and those that are iconic, being embossed with a likeness of an emperor (or an image of a deity?). The *signa*, while also of religious significance, are basically the instruments of tactical procedure and hence essential to all troops engaged in tactical manoeuvres. Each military unit has as many *signa* as it has tactical elements, though in the case of a cohort the *signum* of the *triarii* maniple is simultaneously also the *signum* of the cohort as a whole.

The last type of standard to be mentioned is the *vexillum*, a cloth flag attached to a cross-bar hanging from the top of a pole or spear. It is used by temporary detachments from established military units, which are therefore known as *vexillationes*, and in cavalry *alae*. Under what conditions it served as an identifying medium and as a tactical instrument respectively, is not entirely clear.

[14] To avoid confusion we shall use the term *signum* here wherever this particular type of standard is meant, keeping "standard" as the generic term throughout.

Applying to the episode under discussion what was known about the Roman standards and their use in his day, Domaszewski interpreted the difference between Pilate's procedure and that of his predecessors in terms of the difference between the standards of the several *turmae* composing an *ala* of cavalry and the standard of the *ala* as a whole. The former he regarded as *vexilla*, the latter as an iconic *signum*. According to Domaszewski, then, Pilate permitted the *ala* to bring its *signum* with it to Jerusalem, while his predecessors limited the *ala* to the use of the *vexilla* of the several *turmae*, reducing it, so to speak, to a group of *vexillationes*.[15]

More recent writers on Roman military subjects regard Domaszewski's interpretation as no longer tenable.[16] Some of his assumptions seem to be highly questionable, for instance the assumption that the *signum* was the standard of an *ala* as a whole,[17] and that Pilate could arbitrarily decree what standards a military unit might or might not carry. Other assumptions have been definitely disproven by information made available since his day. Domaszewski formulated his interpretation under the impression that *vexilla* are aniconic and that the only infantry units permitted to use iconic *signa* are the Praetorians. Both of these impressions are now known to be incorrect. An original *vexillum* with the representation of a Niké upon it exists in the Museum of Fine Arts at Moscow,[18] while another, decorated with imperial busts, is portrayed on the Licinius cameo.[19] The standard of an auxiliary cohort, the *cohors VII Raetorum*, its *phalera* showing the likeness of Caligula, has been found in Germany.[20] So far as our present knowledge of the distribution of iconic standards is concerned, it might therefore have been either a cavalry unit or an auxiliary cohort or a

[15] Die Fahnen, especially pp. 27, 69–73.

[16] So e.g. W. Zwikker, "Bemerkungen zu den röm. Heeresfahnen in der älteren Kaiserzeit," Röm.-Germ. Kommission, 27. Bericht, 1937 [1939], pp. 7–22.

[17] For the argument that the standard of the *ala* was the *vexillum* cf. H. Lehner, "Die Standarte der *ala Longiniana*," Bonner Jahrbücher, Vol. 117, 1908, pp. 278–286.

[18] M. I. Rostovtzeff, Monuments in the Museum of Fine Arts in Moscow dedicated to Alexander II, Vol. IV, 1913, pp. 149–153 [in Russian].

[19] R. Delbrück, Antike Porphyrwerke, 1932, Tafel 60a.

[20] E. Neuffer, "Die silberne Signumscheibe aus Niederbieber," Festschrift für August Oxé, 1938, pp. 141–196 and Fig. 1.

group of *vexillationes* that Pilate sent to Jerusalem. In choosing between these possibilities we must be guided not only by what we know and do not know about the Roman standards but also by the exact words of Josephus' statements and by our general knowledge of conditions, geographic and military, in Palestine.

In the Antiquitates Josephus says that the troops sent to Jerusalem were to go into winter quarters there. This statement has no parallel in the Bellum and might be pure inference if Josephus had heard that the movement took place in the late fall.[21] If the statement is true it would militate in some measure against the assumption that the troops in question were *vexillationes*, for such detachments might well be expected to rejoin the units from which they were taken when they were no longer on active duty. If true the statement would argue also against the assumption that an *ala* of cavalry was involved. Climatic conditions and difficulties in the supply of provender being what they were at Jerusalem, one would scarcely expect the city to be chosen as the place to winter a cavalry brigade. If the statement is false general considerations would urge that the cavalry hypothesis be rejected, for Jerusalem was a fortress, not a frontier outpost, and would require infantry as its permanent garrison. It would be better under these circumstances to fall back upon a group of *vexillationes* such as may have had a place in the permanent garrison in the days of Paul.[22]

In the Bellum Josephus speaks of the images of Caesar as things called standards. In the Antiquitates the images are referred to as busts and are said to be attached to the standards. There is room here for some uncertainty as to the type of standard alluded to. The allusion in the Bellum might be to *imagines*, or to *signa*, or even to iconic *vexilla*. The statement in the Antiquitates would be most apt if *signa* were what the writer had in mind. A number of things need to be noted in this connection. The first is that Josephus uses the plural number in speaking of the "effigies" or "busts" in both ac-

[21] On the date of the episode cf. below, pp. 282–283.

[22] It is not certain, of course, that the 70 horsemen and 200 δεξιολάβοι of Acts 23, 23 were actually *vexillationes*.

counts. The second is that it is not at all clear, in fact it is highly improbable, that *vexillationes* carried separate *imagines*, the reason being that they were temporary formations. In the third place it is not clear, and perhaps even improbable, that a single infantry or cavalry unit had more than one *imaginifer*. Finally, it would seem that iconic *vexilla* belonged to a period in Roman military history a good deal later than the days of Pontius Pilate, and that in his day flags with representations of the Emperor were probably quite unknown.

From these considerations it appears that both the group of *vexillationes* and the *ala* of cavalry are open to serious objection on several counts. Only an infantry cohort with iconic *signa* meets all the requirements of the narrative. Auxiliary cohorts are known to have carried iconic *signa* in certain cases, and of the tactical *signa* they each had more than one. An infantry cohort, moreover, Pilate might well have placed in winter quarters at Jerusalem if he was planning to use it in the interior early the next spring. Or, if it was not a matter of temporary quarters, he might have sent it to Jerusalem to replace the one in residence there.

It would be interesting to know what cohort actually played a part in precipitating the episode of the standards. Of course it may have been a unit of whose presence in Palestine we have no information. The choice among those we know about would be easier if it were known why certain cohorts had iconic *signa* while others had *signa* with plain *phalerae*. The fact that the Praetorians regularly had iconic *signa* gives the *II Italica* no special claim to the possession of similar standards. *Phalerae* as such seem to belong to the category of the *dona militaria* awarded in recognition of the unit's services to the state.[23] Conceivably the disc with the image of the Emperor attached to the *signum* is just another type of *donum militare* developed under the principate. If so it would not necessarily be awarded to more than one unit of a military force at one time, and it would be quite possible to suppose that one of the five cohorts *Sebastenorum* had iconic *signa* while the others did not.

[23] Cf. Domaszewski, "Die Rangordnung des römischen Heeres," Bonner Jahrbücher, Vol. 117, 1908, and idem "Die Fahnen," pp. 51–52.

That one of the five cohorts *Sebastenorum* was singled out for special distinction is possible. Acts 27, 1 mentions a σπεῖρα Σεβαστή, that is a unit which has the honorary cognomen *Augusta*.[24] The cohort in question may be the *cohors I Augusta*, which is known to have been in Syria in the early first century A.D.[25] It may, however, be one of the five cohorts *Sebastenorum*, one whose full name was *cohors Augusta Sebastenorum*.[26] Whether a cohort so honored would bear the image of the Emperor upon its *signa* is not known but it is at least possible. If one of the cohorts *Sebastenorum* was so honored and in consequence did bear iconic *signa*, it would be our most likely choice among the units that may have been concerned in the episode of the standards.

While the information available concerning Roman military usage suffices only to tell us what type of unit was probably involved, even a cursory examination of it illumines the circumstances under which episodes like that of the standards could develop, and justifies the view that the incident was not an arbitrary act of provocation. Pilate may have acted in ignorance or in disregard of the Jewish laws, but he can be said probably to have had in mind some purpose in line with his responsibilities as a Roman governor.

Having viewed the episode from the angle of Roman military procedure we must examine it now from the Jewish angle. Probably no one was more surprised than Pilate himself at the intensity of the opposition which his orders called forth. How the tumult began at Jerusalem and spread to the countryside, leading eventually to the dramatic events at Caesarea, Josephus describes in eloquent language. The reason given for the violent reaction is that Pilate's innovation involved an offense against the law forbidding images (Exodus 20, 4). How readily, in spite of more liberal attitudes toward images among Jews of other periods and other parts of the ancient world, an offense against this law could provoke acts of violence in Jerusalem, is well illustrated by the episode of the eagle mounted over the

[24] On the honorary nature of such cognomina as *Augusta*, *Traiana*, etc., cf. Cichorius, R.-E., s.v. *cohors*.

[25] So Broughton, op. cit., pp. 443–444. [26] So Schuerer, op. cit., Vol. I, p. 462.

Temple gate by Herod.[27] The eagle was torn from its place by an angry group of students of the Law and hacked in pieces. What made such objects objectionable, however, was not merely the fact that they were images, but also and more especially the fact that they served as the symbols and instruments of what was to the Jews idolatrous religious practice.[28] This applies directly to the Roman *signa*.

The standards of the Roman army were not only the instruments of military tactics. They were at the same time *numina*, each one the divinity of the unit that bore it. This is true not merely of the later days of which Tertullian speaks when he says exaggeratingly,

Religio Romanorum tota castrensis signa veneratur, signa iurat, signa omnibus deis praeponit. (Apologia 16.)

It is clearly reflected in the votive inscriptions of Roman soldiers of all periods, found across the entire length and breadth of the ancient world, and comes to expression in literary texts as well.[29] Of particular interest in the present context is the statement of Josephus that the Roman soldiers, upon the capture of the Temple at Jerusalem in 71 A.D.,

brought their standards into the Temple and, having set them up opposite its eastern gate, offered sacrifices to them there and hailed Titus as *imperator* (Bellum VI, 6, 1 = § 316).

The reason for and the meaning of the sacrifice are evident: the divinities of the legion have conquered Yahweh, the God of the enemy, and in token of their triumph receive the soldiers' homage in Yahweh's sacred precincts.[30] Such acts of worship, however, were performed not only on the occasion of military victories; they were a regular part of the religion of the army. This is indicated not only by the many representations of cult

[27] Antiquitates XVII, 6, 2–3 = §§ 149–157.

[28] It is apparently because of a tendency to differentiate between images used and not used for idolatrous purposes that the Jews of other periods and of other localities found it possible to employ figured painting and sculpture in the round in the decoration of their synagogues and houses.

[29] On the whole, cf. Domaszewski, Die Religion des römischen Heeres, 1895, reprinted from Westdeutsche Zeitschrift für Geschichte u. Kunst, Vol. XIV, 1895.

[30] So Domaszewski, op. cit., p. 12.

acts of the army at which the standards are officially present, but also and more particularly by celebrations and acts in which the *signa* themselves receive direct homage. Among them are the *dies natalis* of the unit, the various occasions involving a *coronatio signorum*, and in a sense also such festivals as the *rosaliae signorum* of the *Feriale Duranum*.[31] The importance of the standards as divinities comes to further expression in the fact that in all *praetoria* and even in temporary encampments provision was made for a special shrine, a *sacellum*, in which the standards were kept,[32] and where the normal *supplicationes* may have been made.

That the standards of the Roman army could properly be regarded by the Jews as both offensive and dangerous should be perfectly evident from what has been said. The fact is, however, that the religious significance of the standards was not limited to the iconic *signum*, but extended as well to both the aniconic *signum* and the *vexillum*.[33] This inevitably raises the question why, if it was the religious significance of the *imagines* which made the *signa* ordered up by Pilate objectionable, the Jews had not protested the presence of the aniconic standards in the days of his predecessors. Though imageless, the latter were the objects of what the Jews must regard as heathen worship. The question raised cannot be answered with any degree of certainty, but it must receive some consideration if the episode of the standards is to be clarified.

The one thing that can be said with assurance is that during a later phase of Pilate's tenure of office the Jews did protest against aniconic objects to which religious significance was

[31] Bibliography and specific evidence for the cult acts are conveniently accessible in A. S. Hoey, "*Rosaliae Signorum*," HTR, Vol. XXX, 1937, pp. 15–35, esp. pp. 17–20. Cf. also Fink, Hoey and Snyder, "The *Feriale Duranum*" in Yale Classical Studies, Vol. VII, 1940, esp. pp. 115–120. The *Feriale* represents the official religious calendar of an auxiliary cohort, the *cohors XX Palmyrenorum*.

[32] Cf. Domaszewski, op. cit., pp. 9–19, and for a concrete example the Praetorium of Dura, The Excavations at Dura-Europos, Report V, 1934, pp. 201–237, and esp. pp. 213–215. The shrine usually contained, besides the *signa*, an image of the Emperor. Cf. H. Kruse, Studien zur offiziellen Geltung des Kaiserbildes im römischen Kaiserreiche, 1934, pp. 51–79.

[33] Cf. particularly Hoey in Feriale Duranum, pp. 116–118.

ascribed. The protest, which was carried to Tiberius himself and is fully reported by Philo, concerned certain votive shields (ἀσπίδες) set up by Pilate in the Palace of Herod at Jerusalem in honor of the Emperor.[34] They are clearly described as having "no images upon them or anything else that was forbidden," but only certain necessary inscriptions giving the name of the dedicant and that of the person in whose honor the dedication was made. The story is important in showing that it was not the presence or absence of an image to which the Jews objected, but rather the religious significance of the object and of the act by which it was dedicated.[34a] From the fact that the protest against shields *followed* the protest against the iconic standards, it might be inferred that the Roman offenses against the Jewish Law and Jewish religious exclusivism became clear only gradually, and that once they had been brought to light by the appearance of the *signa* they were followed up by the Jews with increasing vigor and attention to detail. Such an inference would be of some help in understanding the relation of the episodes to each other, but not enough to clarify entirely the situation involving the standards. Perhaps the available data will supply additional suggestions for an appraisal of the developments.

In Josephus' story about the eagle which Herod mounted over the gate of the Temple some importance attaches to two rabbis, Judas and Matthias, who apparently were more keenly

[34] Legatio ad Gaium, §§ 299–305. A *clupeus aureus* voted to Augustus by the Roman Senate was set up in the Curia Julia (cf. the record of the action in the Monumentum Ancyranum, ed. J. Gagé, Res Gestae divi Augusti, pp. 144–145). Tiberius, who rejected the honor of a *corona civica*, accepted a *clupeus* (cf. P. L. Strack, Untersuchungen zu der römischen Reichsprägung I, pp. 57 ff.). It may well be that copies of *clupei* set up in Rome were dedicated to the emperors in provincial and military *praetoria*.

[34a] In Legatio ad Gaium, § 133, as Nock reminds me, mention is made of shields which the Jews themselves set up in the synagogues of Alexandria in honor of the Emperor. They were probably analogous in character to those put up by Pilate in the Palace of Herod. That the Jews of Jerusalem objected to the latter, while the Jews of Egypt themselves erected the former, is probably not entirely a matter of the difference between Palestinian and diaspora Judaism. From Legatio, § 137 it is evident that when the rabble of the city mounted the statue of Gaius as a charioteer in the famous *diplostoon* at Alexandria, the effect of the action was to turn the synagogue into a precinct sacred to the Emperor. The Jews of Jerusalem may have feared that Pilate's action might be interpreted to have the same effect.

incensed than the rest and who incited their pupils to the dangerous act of removing the objectionable image. The presence of one or more such activists in the Jerusalem of Pilate's day would go a long way toward explaining the sudden crystallization of popular sentiment against the *signa*.

In the story about the eagle the fact that Herod had the temerity to mount it on the gate of the Temple may be of some significance. Here certainly the symbol of monarchy and deity might readily seem out of place. Could a factor of this kind have played a part in the episode of the standards? The question is, where in Jerusalem did the troops under Pilate's orders take their standards? The answer is, of course, to military headquarters, to the Praetorium of the garrison's *castra stativa*, in short to the Praetorium.

In defining further the location of the military headquarters of the Jerusalem garrison it is quite unnecessary to become involved in the current controversy as to whether the Palace of Herod or the Antonia was *the* Praetorium of Jerusalem.[35]

The name Praetorium can be applied to a variety of establishments ranging all the way from the tent of the commanding officer in a *castra aestiva* and the temporary or permanent residence of a governing official to either the civil or the military headquarters of an established administration.[36] At Jerusalem it is only natural that the governor should use the Palace of Herod as his place of residence. That Pilate did so is clearly indicated by the episode of the votive shields. Detachments of auxiliaries were doubtless stationed there as guards, and Pilate may even have made the Palace the headquarters of his civil administration.[37] There is no reason why, in common parlance, it should not have been called Praetorium. Yet it

[35] The Palace of Herod lay at the northwest corner of the city, near the site of the present Citadel, while the Antonia stood on an eminence at the northwest corner of the Temple precincts. For descriptions of the structures, cf. Josephus, Bellum V, 4, 4 = §§ 176–183 and V, 5, 8 = §§ 238–245. For the literature on the controversy cf. Preuschen-Bauer, Wörterbuch[2], 1928, s.v. πραιτώριον.

[36] Cf. Cagnat, in Daremberg-Saglio, Dictionnaire, s.v. *Praetorium*.

[37] An instance of what is apparently a purely civil Praetorium is provided by the excavations at Gortyna. Cf. M. Guarducci, "Le Iscrizione del Praetorio de Gortina," Rivista del R. Istituto d'Archeologia e Storia dell'Arte, Vol. I, 1929, pp. 143 ff.

would not for that reason necessarily be the military headquarters of the city and the place to which the standards were taken. In Egypt, for instance, the prefect used the Ptolemaic palace of Alexandria as his place of residence, but military headquarters lay outside the city limits. In the East, however, the military encampment was not normally or necessarily outside the city.[38] Indeed the tendency appears to have been to utilize favorable features of the terrain for the location of permanent military encampments protecting and controlling the cities of which they were a part.[39] At Jerusalem the fortress Antonia on the eminence at the northwest corner of the Temple court provided the best vantage point for the control of the city.[40] It is to the Antonia that we must therefore look as the military headquarters of Jerusalem. The correctness of this conclusion is borne out not only by the statement of Josephus to the effect that a Roman military force was always quartered there,[41] but also by the episode of Paul's rescue from the mob in the Temple court as described in Acts 21, 30–36. From the account it appears that the ranking officer of the garrison is immediately available to handle the sudden disturbance in the Temple. As the narrative is told it develops that the report of the outbreak is carried *up* to the tribune, who runs *down* to the Temple court and finally takes Paul up certain steps to his place of protective custody. The requirements of the story are fully met by the assumption that it was the Antonia where the

[38] Dura provides an excellent example of a military Praetorium inside the city limits. Cf. Excavations at Dura-Europos, Report V, 1934, pp. 201–237. There are other examples, for instance Palmyra. On the effects of the overly close association of the soldiers with the life of the cities cf. the comment of Rostovtzeff in Excavations at Dura-Europos, Report VI, 1936, pp. 302–303.

[39] Excavations at Chersonesus and Olbia have provided examples of military strongholds established at strategic points in the defenses of important cities. For bibliography on these excavations cf. the articles by Rostovtzeff s.v. Chersoneso in Enciclopedia Italiana, and by Diehl s.v. Olbia in R.-E.

[40] Its stragetic importance is clearly demonstrated by the fact that Titus, having captured the northern suburbs in the siege of 71 A.D., directed the brunt of his further assault against the Antonia. Once this key position was in his hands, he was able to take the Temple and the rest of the city without difficulty. Cf. the account of the siege in Bellum V–VI.

[41] Bellum V, 5, 8 = § 244. The word used to describe the force is *τάγμα*. On its meaning cf. above n. 12.

tribune had his headquarters.[42] Acts speaks of the structure as the παρεμβολή (= *castra*). It can scarcely be wrong, under the circumstances, to regard it as the military Praetorium of the city.

If the Antonia was, as seems likely, the military headquarters of Jerusalem, it was there that the troops dispatched by Pilate brought their standards.[43] The great fortress belonged in a real sense to the Temple complex. It stood on the highest part of the Temple hill,[44] overlooking both the inner and the outer courtyard of the sanctuary. With the outer court it was directly connected by staircases that gave upon the porticoes. From the northern part of the city it was separated by a deep moat. It is not surprising, therefore, to find that Josephus describes the fortress in his account of the Temple, and that in Pilate's day the Antonia was the place where the sacred vestments of the Jewish high priest were kept, under the watchful eyes of the Roman garrison.[45] These facts are, however, unusually suggestive for the understanding of the Jewish reaction to Pilate's innovation. The introduction of the iconic *signa* into the Antonia was more than merely a particularly flagrant and patent violation of the law against images. It gave occasion to the performance in the fortress of acts of religious devotion in which the image of the Emperor was involved and thereby not only jeopardized the sanctity of the official vestments but also threatened the supremacy of Yahweh on his holy hill. No wonder, then, that the Jews reacted so violently to Pilate's action.

[42] This is admitted by virtually all commentators upon Acts.

[43] The conclusion that the Antonia was the military Praetorium does not necessarily imply that it was the scene of Jesus' trial. Pilate may well have conducted non-military trials at his residence in the Palace of Herod. Neither are the remains of the paved courtyard of the Antonia to which Vincent points (op. cit., pp. 102–107 and Plates VII–VIII), and which he regards as the λιθόστρωτος of John 19, 13 decisive. Paved rather than landscaped courtyards are familiar features of certain types of dwellings (e.g. private houses at Delos, cf. W. A. Laidlaw, A History of Delos, 1933, pp. 240–243), and one or more may readily have existed in the Palace of Herod. It may of course be that the author of the Gospel of John has arbitrarily associated the pavement of the Antonia's court, which in later days served as an open square, with the scene of Jesus' trial. But this would not be decisive.

[44] For a detailed description, complete with photographs, plans and elevations, cf. L. H. Vincent, "L'Antonie et le Prétoire," RB, Vol. XLII, 1933, pp. 83–113.

[45] Antiquitates XVIII, 4, 3 = §§ 90–95.

What the Jews demanded of Pilate, according to Josephus, was the removal of the standards. The standards in question were, as the Bellum indicates, those with the images upon them. In the light of what happened subsequently it would not be amiss to conjecture that once the religious associations of the *signa* had been made plain by the iconic standards, the demand was for the removal of all such idolatrous objects, whether iconic or aniconic. In that case Pilate's action in withdrawing the iconic *signa* would have been a compromise. The suggestion that the demand was more inclusive than Pilate's response would make the Jewish attitude more logical, both in the episode of the standards and in the episode of the votive shields,[46] and would simultaneously explain one additional historical fact. When in 36 A.D. Vitellius, the legate of Syria, came to Palestine and removed Pilate from office, he was confronted with and granted one further Jewish demand. The demand was for the return of the high-priestly vestments to Jewish control.[47] By the removal of these garments from the Antonia the Jews may have thought to lessen the danger of the aniconic cult in the fortress to the purity of their religious acts.

Should it be legitimate to combine all these possible lines of interpretation the episode of the standards might be reconstructed somewhat as follows. Shortly after his entrance into office Pilate ordered certain elements of the Roman auxiliaries in his territory to proceed into winter quarters at Jerusalem. In so doing he was either increasing the strength of the Jerusalem garrison or replacing the cohort already stationed there with another more distinguished for its service in the Roman cause than its predecessor. In either case the regulations of the military code required that the detachment take with it the standards of the unit, standards upon which the image of the Emperor appeared. No such standards had previously been brought into Jerusalem and the religious significance of those already there (whether *vexilla* or *signa* with plain *phalerae*) had

[46] The protest against the iconic standards and the shields could be thought of as succeeding because both were recent innovations, while the protest against the aniconic *signa* failed because they had been tolerated since the days of Archelaus' death, and because some form of *signum* was essential to the life of the military garrison.

[47] Antiquitates XVIII, 4, 3 = §§ 90–95.

either escaped the Jews or had not been made an issue because they did not infringe upon the letter of the law against idolatry. Once the presence of the iconic *signa* in the Antonia was discovered, there was a tremendous outcry. The law against images had been transgressed, the sanctity of the high-priestly vestments polluted, and the supremacy of the cult of Yahweh on his holy hill threatened. The tumult at Jerusalem was followed by official protests at Caesarea in which the removal of all Roman religious paraphernalia was demanded. Pilate, who had either not foreseen or had chosen to regard as unimportant the difficulties caused by his orders, granted the removal of the troops whose presence accounted for the introduction of the iconic standards. He did not find it either possible or necessary to remove all standards, and the Jews were not in a position to push their demands to the limit because they had not previously objected to the aniconic *signa*. This left an element of dissatisfaction with Pilate's action. The dissatisfaction led to a vigorous protest against votive shields set up in the Palace of Herod, a protest which had a chance of success because the shields were newly set up. Finally at the end of Pilate's tenure of office arrangements were made to have the high-priestly vestments removed from the Antonia, thereby lessening the immediate danger of pollution to the Jewish sacrifices. Reduced to an aniconic status the religious observance of the garrison in the Antonia was permitted to continue until in 66 A.D. the Jewish revolutionaries captured both the Antonia and the Palace of Herod, dispossessing the Roman cohorts.

With the details of the episode of the standards clearly in mind it is possible to ask whether it had any significance for developments in the New Testament sphere. No such significance has ever been suggested and any suggestions that may be made here must be regarded merely as tentative. To have had any bearing whatsoever upon the events of Gospel history the episode would have had to occur before 30 A.D. That it did, seems quite likely. Involving an innovation in procuratorial procedure, and revealing either a profound ignorance of Jewish law or a complete lack of understanding of the people he was sent to govern, or both, the episode should be assigned to the

earlier years of Pilate's tenure of office. Indeed, the likeliest date of all is the very first year of his procuratorship, 26 A.D.[48]

The account in the Antiquitates, by specifying that the troops carrying the objectionable *signa* were going into winter quarters, implies that the events in question took place in the late fall. Of a late date in the Julian calendar year there may be an element of confirmation in the Megillat Taanith, which says that "on the third of Chislev the סימותא were removed from the court (דרתא)." [49] What episode is referred to is not entirely clear. Much depends upon the interpretation of the word סימיא. If, as most scholars seem to believe, it renders the Greek *σημαία* (and not *σημεῖον*), the reference must be to the episode of the standards under discussion here.[50] The Megillat could then be used to substantiate the extreme importance of the events from the Jewish point of view, and to attest to what was said above about the place where the standards were taken.[51] For our immediate purpose, however, the importance of the reference is that it points to a date late in the fall (November–December), as Josephus implies. If the year and the season suggested are even approximately correct, the episode of the standards becomes one of the few events in Palestinian history known to us from the general period of Gospel story. If, moreover, it was as important as it seems to have been to the Jews at home and abroad, we might well expect to find in Gospel story some reflection of it.

One of the basic problems of New Testament study is how to account for the strong sense of crisis that pervaded the Christian movement at its beginning. That the final divine judgment was imminent was axiomatic for Jesus and his early followers.

[48] So apparently Schuerer, op. cit., Vol. I, p. 489 and more recently Olmstead, op. cit., pp. 50–51. Of the episodes from the procuratorship of Pilate narrated by Josephus that of the standards comes first in both the Bellum and the Antiquitates.

[49] The text is conveniently accessible in G. Dalman, Aramäische Dialektproben, 1896, p. 2.

[50] So Dalman, op. cit. in the Vocabulary s.v. סימיא; Fränkel, MGWJ, Vol. III, 1854, p. 444, n. 9, and more recently S. Zeitlin, Megillat Taanith, 1922, pp. 87–88.

[51] These matters would be still further substantiated if Eusebius is correct in saying that "Philo also witnesses to these things saying that Pilate set up the imperial standards (*σημαίαι*) in the Temple at night," Demonstratio Evangelica VIII, 2, 123 (ed. Heikel, GCS, Vol. XXIII, p. 390).

Yet Jesus did not arrive at this conviction by himself. He inherited it from John the Baptist in whose ringing prophecies the message of impending doom was even more central than in the teaching of his successor. Up to this point everything is quite clear. But when the question is raised, Whence came John's conviction? it is difficult to give a precise and satisfactory answer.

That the appearance of a strong eschatological conviction in both John and Jesus is indeed to be associated with and in part even to be explained by the Old Testament, is perfectly clear. The religion of Israel, as one that was founded upon a sense of covenant relation between God and man, necessarily involved for all its believers a strong commitment to a national hope and the expectation of participation in the covenant promises. Depending upon whether the individual's outlook was optimistic or pessimistic, it was always possible to envisage deliverance or doom as looming ahead. But it is one thing to share in such a hope or expectation, and quite another thing to proclaim its realization in the immediate future. Three things are apparently required to produce such a proclamation. The first is a contemporary scene with circumstances auguring the fulfillment. Where the proclamation is one of doom the circumstances must tend to jeopardize the ideals to which the national hope gives expression. The second is a temperament that reacts to the circumstances with sufficient intensity to cause the foreshortening of perspective upon the historical process that all prophecy involves. The third is the sense of personal participation in the circumstances and the divine purposes supposedly coming to expression in them, a participation sufficiently immediate to call forth a proclamation made in the name of deity. Of these three factors only the first is sufficiently objective to provide a field of inquiry into the origin of a prophetic pronouncement such as that of John the Baptist.

Since the days of Pompey there had, of course, existed in Jewish life a broad contradiction between the ideal of national integrity and the hope of the nation's leadership in world affairs on the one side, and Roman or Herodian domination and the secularization of even the higher religious circles on the

other. This combination had in the first century B.C. engaged the attention of the circles from which the Psalms of Solomon emanated, evoking from them new prayers for the coming of a deliverer and new assurances that in view of the chastisements of the present God's intervention could not be long delayed (Ps. of Solomon 17–18). That this basic contradiction may have played its part in heightening the sense of tension reflected in the Baptist's proclamation is quite probable, especially in view of the fact that the appearance of Roman procurators in Judea and the gradual degeneration of the high-priesthood had served to accentuate it. Usually, however, it requires some personal experience or some particular event to ignite the fire of prophetic intuition and to produce the prophetic pronouncement. Our knowledge of the Baptist's early life and of contemporary developments being what it is, there is little if anything to which we can point with any assurance of its having provided the spark necessary to ignite the flame. All that is known is that the Baptist must have appeared upon the scene with his message of doom between 27 and 29 A.D. If the date suggested for it is correct, the only episode about which we know anything at all from this period of Palestinian history is the episode of the standards. The question is whether it could have had any bearing upon the development of a sense of doom such as found expression in the Baptist's preaching.

In this connection it is important to recall that there were at least two other episodes in the later history of the Jews when the supremacy of the cult of Yahweh on the mount of the Temple was threatened. The first is that of the year 167 B.C., when Antiochus IV, in pursuance of his well defined religious policy, transformed the Jerusalem Temple into what was represented as a sanctuary of Zeus Olympius.[52] In the course of the transformation a likeness of the king was set up in the Temple, but whether as a cult image of Zeus that had his features or as a statue of the king that had no real cultic significance is not clear.[53] The second episode is that of the years 39–41 A.D.,

[52] II Maccabees 6. On the nature of the policy and its relation to the Jerusalem episode, cf. E. Bickermann, Der Gott der Makkabäer, 1937, esp. pp. 90–116.

[53] The former is the view of E. Bevan, CAH, Vol. VIII, 1930, p. 508, and C. C.

when the Emperor Gaius ordered the erection of his statue in the Temple as a reprisal for an offense committed against his person at Jamnia.[54] The first of these episodes provoked the prophecy of Daniel in which it was announced that from the erection of the "abomination of desolation" [55] to the divine judgment was a matter of but 1290 days or three and one-half years (Dan. 12, 11). From the Jewish point of view, if the judgment had not come when expected, the fault could not possibly be the oracle's. The prophecy, therefore, was still to be fulfilled. It is not surprising under the circumstances to find Christian prophets of those troubled years 39–41 A.D. seeing in Gaius' proposal the occasion of its imminent fulfillment, and creating in the prophecies of Mark 13 the expression of their belief in the coming of divine judgment.[56] Yet what was threatening in these later years was only what had actually occurred probably in 26 A.D., when the Roman standards with their images of the Emperor were set up in the Antonia on the Temple hill as the *numina* of the garrison's worship. Conceivably it was at this time that the inference about the impending fulfillment of Daniel's prophecy was first drawn. If so it may have had some bearing upon the Baptist's proclamation of an imminent judgment.

There may be a more immediate repercussion of the episode of the standards in a saying of Jesus reported in the discourse Luke 13. The opening verses of the chapter tell the following story:

> At that very time certain people came telling him (Jesus) about the Galileans whose blood Pilate mingled with that of their sacrifices. And answering he said to them, Do you think that because they met this fate these Galileans were greater sinners than the rest? No! I tell you that unless you repent you will all perish likewise.

Torrey, Documents of the Primitive Church, 1941, pp. 25–27, while the latter is the view of Bickermann, op. cit., p. 112.

[54] Philo, Legatio ad Gaium, §§ 203–260, cf. Josephus, Bellum II, 10 = §§ 184–203.

[55] Whether the "abomination of desolation" was the (cult) image or the new altar erected in the Temple is in dispute but need not be an issue in the present context. In the period of the New Testament the words were clearly taken to refer to the image of a person (cf. Mk. 13, 14).

[56] Cf. B. W. Bacon, The Gospel of Mark, 1925, pp. 53–98, and Torrey, op. cit., pp. 22–40.

The discourse continues with a reference to eighteen residents of Jerusalem who were killed by the fall of a tower at Siloam, and asks whether they also could be considered more sinful than the other residents of Jerusalem (vs. 4–5). Clearly, then, we are dealing with two sayings of Jesus in which he is trying to give a new turn to the interpretation of current events. Instead of interpreting the events in question as demonstrating the judgment that overtakes the sinful individual, as his contemporaries would have done, Jesus regards them as warnings of an impending judgment upon the entire nation. These typical sayings Luke introduces with a statement showing how information concerning the fate of the Galileans reached Jesus. The arrival of the information prompts the utterance of the saying and in so doing seems to imply that the episode in question has just taken place. That an episode of this type did occur at approximately the time implied in Luke's statement is entirely possible. Olmstead has associated the events plausibly with the episode of the aqueduct built by Pilate.[57] On the other hand it is quite permissible to disregard the chronological implications of Luke's introduction. Because they were trying to write connected historical narrative all our Evangelists were put to the necessity of creating or recreating the settings for the individual sayings and stories of the oral tradition. The situations developed were in large measure artificial.[58] In the passage before us the people who come bringing the information about the death of the Galileans need be no more than the medium chosen by Luke to convey to the reader an elementary knowledge of the episode to which one of Jesus' sayings alludes.[59] Hence, while there is no cogent reason for doubting that an episode such as that which Luke describes did occur, and that it was the subject of the allusion in Jesus' word, there is no reason to limit the date of its occurrence by the specific wording of Luke's statement. It is tempting, under these circum-

[57] Op. cit., pp. 147–149.

[58] Cf. on the whole subject K. L. Schmidt, Der Rahmen der Geschichte Jesu, 1919.

[59] The time reference contained in the words "at that very time" is a familiar device used to enliven the narrative. Cf. the frequent use of "at that hour" by Luke (2, 38; 10, 21; 13, 31; 20, 19; 24, 33) and its introduction in 20, 19 where the Markan source (Mk. 12, 12) has no time reference.

stances, to conjecture that the episode in question belongs to the "tumult" which developed at Jerusalem, according to Josephus, when the presence and significance of the iconic *signa* were discovered. Of course it is unnecessary to infer from the clause "whose blood Pilate mingled with that of their sacrifices" either that Pilate himself had a hand in the matter or that the bloodshed occurred in the inner court of the Temple where the sacrifices were made. The death of worshippers at the hands of Roman soldiers in any part of the Temple on any occasion would be enough to provoke this graphic description of the event. If the standards were taken to the Antonia any tumult caused by their discovery would have taken place in the adjacent outer court of the Temple. A violent demonstration on that occasion, requiring the intervention of the garrison to disperse the mob, might well have brought death to certain hotheaded Galilean participants. Their death under such circumstances would have been sufficiently significant to provoke a saying by Jesus.

To anyone looking for possible repercussions of the episode of the standards in the events of New Testament history one further line of speculation readily suggests itself. Gospel record creates the impression that a strong eschatological tension pervaded Jesus' last days at Jerusalem. The impression is conveyed by the story of Jesus' entry into the city, by the episode of the Cleansing of the Temple, by the nature of certain of the disputations conducted in the Temple court, by the eschatological discourse of Mark 13 and by the Woes and the parables of judgment which Matthew adds to the picture. In some measure the assignment of so much eschatological material to the last days of Jesus' life is undoubtedly editorial, but the allocation itself requires some explanation and a certain amount of eschatological tension the events of the Passion itself seem to presuppose. In the minds of the Galilean pilgrims the presence of the prophet from Nazareth may have served to kindle the fires of enthusiasm and excitement. To Jesus the spectacle of an unrepentant city making ready to celebrate the festival of national deliverance may have portended the imminence of divine retribution. Possibly, however, there were also those

whom the eschatological potential of the episode of the standards held in suspense. The episode, it will be recalled, had occurred most probably in the fall of 26 A.D., and Daniel had specified an interval of three and one-half years between the appearance of the "abomination of desolation" and the coming of judgment. In the spring of 30 A.D., the season and probably also the very year of Jesus' final, tragic appeal to Jerusalem, these three and one-half years were due to expire. To suggestible minds this could have provided an occasion for speculation and excitement at the time of the fatal Passover.

PRE-MACCABEAN DOCUMENTS IN THE PASSOVER HAGGADAH

LOUIS FINKELSTEIN
Jewish Theological Seminary of America

In an article published in the Harvard Theological Review, XXXI, pp. 291–317, I endeavored to show that the Midrash based on Deuteronomy 26. 5–8, which forms the core of the Passover Haggadah (hereinafter M) was composed in pre-Maccabean times, probably in the third century B.C., when Palestine was ruled by the Ptolemies. I propose in the present article to consider three other parts of the Haggadah, which I believe are likewise pre-Maccabean.[1] They are (1) the opening passage (hereinafter A); (2) the alternative opening (hereinafter B) prescribed by Rab in the third century of the Christian Era, and included in extant rituals after A; and (3) the poem Dayyenu, "it would have been ample for us" (hereinafter D). Evidence will be presented associating B and D particularly with the high priesthood of Jason, the son of Simeon the Righteous, and high priest in Jerusalem from 175 to 172 B.C.[2] In connection with the discussion of these passages, it will be necessary to study also (4) the *Baraita* of the Four Sons (hereinafter E), which has also been incorporated into the Passover Haggadah. (A *baraita* is a formulated, normative statement, originating with the earlier Rabbinic scholars, i.e. those of the Mishnaic or tannaitic period, ending about the year 220 of the Christian Era; but not included in the Mishna itself.)

[1] See pp. 330 ff., where the *sigla* used herein are explained.

[2] The deviations in this article from the usual chronology follow, in general, the results of the researches of F. X. Kugler, Von Moses bis Paulus, 1922, chaps. VI and VII; W. Kolbe, Beitraege z. Syrischen u. juedischen Geschichte, 1926; and E. Bickermann, Der Gott d. Makkabaeer, 1937. The most significant achievement of these studies is the establishment of the year 311 B.C. as the opening date of the Seleucid Era; the fixing of 167 B.C. as that of the profanation of the Temple of Jerusalem by Antiochus IV; and of 164 B.C. as the date of the rededication.

I. The Introduction to the Passover Haggadah (A)

The opening of the Passover Haggadah, according to extant rituals, is essentially a reply to the questions raised by, or put into the mouth of, the child, asking the reasons for the celebration. The father says:

"We were Pharaoh's bondmen in Egypt; and the Lord, our God (Hebrew: *YHWH Elohenu*)[3] brought us forth from there [4] with a mighty hand and an outstretched arm."

This passage is clearly adapted from Deuteronomy 6. 20 ff. which reads as follows:

"When thy son asketh thee in time to come, saying, 'What mean the testimonies, and the statutes, and the ordinances, which the Lord our God hath commanded you?' Then shalt thou say unto thy son: 'We were Pharaoh's bondmen in Egypt; and the Lord brought us out of Egypt with a mighty hand. And the Lord showed signs and wonders, great and sore, upon Egypt, upon Pharaoh, and upon all his house, before our eyes. And He brought us out from thence, that He might bring us in, to give us the land which He swore unto our fathers. And the Lord commanded us to do all these statutes, to fear the Lord our God, for our good always, that He might preserve us alive, as it is at this day. And it shall be righteousness unto us, if we observe to do all this commandment before the Lord our God, as He hath commanded us.'"

The first unmistakable reference to A is that made by Samuel,[5] a Babylonian scholar of the third century of the Christian Era. But the following considerations will show that A originated as the opening of the Passover Haggadah long before the time of Samuel.

Comparing A with the Biblical passage on which it is based, we notice that the compiler of A not only omitted four verses of the five which the Scriptures prescribe as a reply to the inquiring son, but also took liberties in his citation of the one

[3] The reading *adonai* (or YHWH) *elohenu* is found in M, following precisely the text of Scripture. It is altogether probable that this text represents a reading which was "corrected" to agree with that of Scripture; or that the word *elohenu* was omitted in this text by accident.

[4] Heb. *misham*, instead of *mimizraim*, as the Scriptures read in the corresponding passage; see below, p. 295. The words "and an outstretched arm" are found in the Septuagint and in Vetus Latina though they are lacking in all the other versions. This significant agreement between the Passover Haggadah and the Septuagint was first noticed by David Hoffmann, in Magazin f. d. Wissenschaft d. Judenthums 13, 1886, p. 193, note 1. With regard to the significance of the other variant readings to this passage, see Friedmann, p. 51.

[5] Pesahim 116a.

verse which he preserved. Such liberty in dealing with Scripture reflects some impelling necessity, which, when discovered, should give us a clue to the date of the origin of A.

The omission of the last four verses of the Biblical passage and the changes introduced in the verse which was kept, are all clearly prompted by a desire to avoid giving offense to the people of Egypt. In discussing the date and origin of M, I showed [6] that this Egyptophilism is associated with the political conditions of the third century B.C., when Palestine was under the rule of the Egyptian Ptolemies. During all that time, the Seleucids, who were rivals of the Ptolemies, sought to regain the control of Palestine. As the two empires, namely Ptolemaic Egypt and Seleucid Syria, were about equal in power, the friendship of the people of Palestine, which lay midway between them and whose territory was claimed by both, was of vast political importance. Inevitably, the sympathies of the Palestinian Jews were divided.[7] This fact, however, only made it the more necessary for the responsible leaders of the people to avoid any action or public ceremonial which could be interpreted as anti-Egyptian and therefore pro-Seleucid. Unfortunately, the Passover celebration was by its very nature a celebration of the triumph of Israel over Egypt, and therefore anti-Egyptian in character.[8] Added to this was the fact that the Passover celebration, which brought to Jerusalem throngs of pilgrims from all parts of Palestine and even other countries, was in all ages a period favorable to riot and rebellion. As late as the Roman and Herodian rule, Passover

[6] Harvard Theological Review, XXXI, 1938, pp. 300–301.

[7] This is implied in Dan. 11. 14; and is explicitly stated to have been the fact, in Jerome's Commentary to that verse (Patr. Latin. XXV, 562). Reference to Egyptian and Seleucid parties in Coele-Syria is also made by Polybius (Histories V, 86. 10). See further regarding the whole matter, R. H. Charles, A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Book of Daniel, 1929, ad loc.; E. Meyer, Ursprung u. Anfaenge d. Christentums, 1921, II, 136; V. Tscherikower, Ha-Yehudim veha-Yevanim, (hereinafter Tscherikower) 1931, pp. 194 ff.; and his Palestine under the Ptolemies in Mizraim, IV–V, 1937 (hereinafter, Tscherikower, Palestine), p. 56; E. Bickerman, in Revue des Études Juives C bis, 1935, p. 24. Regarding the general extent and influence of Egyptian rule in Syria and Palestine, see K. J. Beloch, Griechische Geschichte, IV, 2, pp. 322–323.

[8] Regarding the relationship of Egyptian antisemitism to the story of the Exodus and the Jewish celebration of Passover, see Additional Note.

was a season of trial to the governing and ecclesiastical authorities.[9] It must have been a greater trial to the earlier rulers, the Ptolemies. For these reasons statements which might have been passed over as innocuous at other times, were considered offensive by the Egyptian rulers and their Jewish adherents, when uttered in connection with the Passover celebration. Thus the recital of the Pentateuchal passage, used during the ceremony of the first fruits,[10] must have seemed to the Jews an appropriate formula for the story of the Exodus: "A Syrian, ready to perish, was my father, and he went down into Egypt, and sojourned there with a few, and became there a nation, great, mighty, and populous; and the Egyptians evil entreated us, and afflicted us, and laid upon us hard bondage; And when we cried unto the Lord, God of our fathers, the Lord heard our voice, and looked on our affliction, and our labor, and our oppression; And the Lord brought us forth out of Egypt with a mighty hand, and an outstretched arm, and with great terribleness, and with signs, and with wonders" (Deuteronomy 26. 5–8).[11]

But the Egyptian officials, on the other hand, must have thought that the declaration that the people of Israel were the kinsmen of the Syrians,[12] that Israel was enslaved in Egypt, and that only through the sufferings of the Egyptians did Israel gain its freedom, hardly helped cement the bonds between Palestine and Egypt. The Palestinian authorities were thus virtually compelled to create in M a midrash which made Deuteronomy 26. 5–8 an anti-Syrian document, and purged it at least of its worst anti-Egyptian overtones. Thus the phrase, "A Syrian, ready to perish, was my father," becomes in M, "The Syrian sought to destroy my father." [13]

The shortening of the reply prescribed in Deuteronomy 6. 21 ff. into A is clearly intended to achieve a similar purpose.

[9] Cf. J. Bonsirven, Le Judaïsme Palestinien au Temps de Jésus-Christ, 1935, II, 122.

[10] See Deut. 26. 1 ff.; Mishna Bikkurim 3. 6.

[11] See HTR, loc. cit.

[12] See below, note 56.

[13] See Additional Note B for a discussion of changes in Jewish ritual for apologetic purposes.

Deuteronomy 6. 22 was necessarily omitted from the reply, for its vivid description of the sufferings of the ancient Egyptians at the hands of Israel could not be explained away. Because of the omission of Deuteronomy 6. 22, all the following verses included in the reply, too, had to be omitted.

Even Deuteronomy 6. 21, however, had to be altered somewhat. The substitution of the word *misham* ("from there")[14] for *mimizraim* ("out of Egypt") is apparently intended to clarify a possible ambiguity, which might have been particularly disturbing when Palestine was under Egyptian domination. The word *mimizraim* might mean not only "out of Egypt" but also "from the Egyptians." But obviously the Jews in Palestine of the third century B.C. were still under Egyptian domination. Hence the necessary substitution of *misham* ("from there") to indicate that the redemption of Israel from the land of Egypt is what is meant.

In this changed form, "We were Pharaoh's bondmen in Egypt, and the Lord, our God, brought us forth from there with a mighty hand and an outstretched arm," might, indeed, become an expression of loyalty to the Egyptian empire.[15]

[14] See above, note 4.

[15] The question of the juridical right of Egypt to Palestine was a matter of prime importance in the Hellenistic period. Both the Seleucids and the Ptolemies made amazing efforts to justify their claims to the territories they sought to control by appeals to precedent and right (see CAH, VII, pp. 13; 133 ff.; 161 ff.; E. Bikerman, Institutions des Séleucides, Paris, 1938 (hereinafter Inst. Sel.), pp. 15 ff.). In Additional Note A, evidence will be adduced for the probability that Manetho's story of the origin of "Jerusalem" as a state was part of this tendency to justify might by right. Such appeals to right, as a basis for territorial claims, can of course be duplicated in far higher antiquity. Cf., e.g., the argument between Jephthah and the Ammonites regarding the relative claims of Israel and Ammon to the disputed part of Transjordan (Judg. 11. 12 ff.).

It is interesting to note that the antisemitic writers of a later period, when the question of the juridical right of the Egyptians to Palestine had ceased to be an issue, no longer stressed the Egyptian origin of the Jews. Nevertheless, the older tradition persisted among many writers (cf. e.g. Chaeremon, cited in Jos., Contra Ap. I, 288 ff.; and Apion, ibid. II, 6 ff.). Under the Roman rule, the tradition of Egyptian background became indeed a means of deriding the Jews, denying them any claim to a special and significant place in history (see Bergmann, Jued. Apologetik, p. 146). The Palestinian Jewish scholars, aware of the charges of Egyptian origin, and sensitive to their implications, created a literature of Jewish apologetics, stressing the early origin of Israel (see below, p. 310), and above all denying the charge that the Israelites were born of relations between Egyptian masters and Israelite women. Bergmann, loc. cit. mentions a

The conjecture that this passage was given its present form in the third century B.C. is corroborated by the fact that the word *elohenu* ("our God") is inserted in A after the word *adonai*, "the Lord," of the Biblical text. The third century B.C. witnessed the substitution of the pronunciation *adonai* for the original pronunciation of YHWH.[16] The first substitute pronunciation, introduced at an earlier time, had been *elohim*,[17] as can be seen from the second and third books of the Psalter, as well as from certain passages in Chronicles.[18] The pietists of the third century B.C. felt, however, that the term *elohim* expressed an impersonal philosophical approach to God, and preferred the pronunciation *adonai* for YHWH. As this term has also a secular meaning, "my lord," [19] and might therefore

---

few references bearing on the general subject. But the insistence on the chastity of the Jewish wives in Egypt is a common motif in Rabbinic literature. Compare e.g. Mekilta, Bo, chap. 5, ed. Friedmann 5a; Horowitz-Rabin 14; Lauterbach I, 34.

[16] Regarding the time when the pronunciation *adonai* was substituted for the original pronunciation of YHWH, see G. Dalman, Der Gottesname Adonai, Berlin, 1889, pp. 63–81; B. Jacob, Im Namen Gottes, Berlin, 1903, pp. 164–176; H. H. Schaeder, Iranische Beitraege I, Halle, 1930, pp. 205–206. Schaeder adduces convincing evidence to show that the original pronunciation ceased to be used in the course of the fifth century B.C. B. Jacob demonstrates that the Chronicler pronounced the tetragrammaton *adonai*, but he also shows that the pronunciation *elohim* was used as a variant. (It may ultimately turn out that the author of the original "Book of Chronicles," i.e., of the older stratum, pronounced YHWH *elohim*, and the later reviser pronounced it *adonai*. In that event the distinction may help the separation of the older from the later material.) In any event it is clear that during the third century B.C., the use of the pronunciation *adonai* was probably not yet sufficiently well established to exclude the meaning of "my lord" in a human sense. The later Sages recalled definitely that the "Men of the Great Assembly" used the original pronunciation of the tetragrammaton (Midrash Tehillim 36. 8, ed. Buber 126a) but we cannot be certain whether they refer to the generation of Ezra or that of Simeon the Righteous; for both are described in Rabbinical literature as belonging to the Great Assembly.

[17] See B. Jacob, Im Namen Gottes, 1903, pp. 16 ff. Passages like Ps. 53. 3, 5, 6, which consistently substitute *elohim* for the YHWH of corresponding verses in Ps. 14; and a passage like Ps. 68. 8, where *elohim* replaces YHWH of Judges 5. 4 amply demonstrate that the compiler of that collection of Psalms at least sometimes writes *elohim* for YHWH.

[18] B. Jacob, op. cit., pp. 165 ff. Cf., also, H. Zimmermann, *Elohim*, Berlin, 1900, pp. 64 ff.

[19] As G. Dalman has noticed (Die Worte Jesu, 1930, p. 268), the expression, *ishi kohen gadol* ("my lord, high priest"), was coined in order to avoid applying the term *adoni*, used for God, to a human superior. *Ishi* in the sense of "my lord" occurs only in this expression (see Mishna Yoma 1. 3, 5; 4. 1; Tamid 6. 3; Parah 3. 8). See, in this connection, also Jewish Quarterly Review, N. S., XXXII, 1942, p. 396, n.

be taken to refer to a human master, it was necessary in oral prayers to add some qualification showing that it referred to the Deity. Hence, prayers and other liturgical formulae originating in the third century B.C. and for some generations thereafter, add the term *elohim* or *elohenu* to *adonai*.[20]

The compiler of the Passover Haggadah intended of course that the word YHWH in the first verse should be pronounced *adonai*. Following the general rule, therefore, he was compelled to add *elohenu* after it.

The evidence that A was formulated in the third century B.C. is completed by the fact that it contains the phrase "and with an outstretched arm." This phrase is omitted in Deuteronomy 6. 21 according to the Massoretic text, as well as the Samaritan, Peshitto, Vulgate and Targumim. In fact, it occurs only in LXX and the Vetus Latina.[21] Quite aside from all

[20] See Jewish Quarterly Review, N. S., XVI, 1925, pp. 8 ff. When I noted these facts, I did not realize their reason or their significance. Clearly, the Men of the Great Assembly who formulated the earliest form of the Amidah and of the Birkat Ha-Mazon, like the compiler of the Haggadah had to use the term *adonai elohenu*, in speaking of the Deity, in order to avoid any misunderstanding. Later authors, recoiling even from the use of the term *adonai*, substituted *abinu* ("our father") or *elohenu* ("our God") for it. It is noteworthy, however, that the call to "bless the Lord" used by the person about to read the Shema in the daily prayers, or the portion of the Law, at services when that is read, says: *bareku 'et 'adonai*. This formula can be traced back to the times of the Temple, but is obviously much older; for it goes back to a time when it was not yet necessary to indicate that one was speaking of the Divine rather than a human Lord; in other words to a time when the tetragrammaton was pronounced in its original form. Now the pronunciation of the tetragrammaton as YHWH continued in the Temple long after it had been abandoned in the synagogue service (Mishna Yoma 6. 2; Sotah 7. 6; Tamid 7. 2). If therefore the call *bareku 'et 'adonai* (YHWH) originated as part of a Temple service, it could only indicate a date about 200 B.C. (Presumably, the pronunciation YHWH in a *call* to the service would not have been used after that date, even in the Temple.) On the other hand, if the call originated in the Synagogue service, it would point to an origin at a much earlier date, perhaps no later than the beginning of the fourth century B.C. As it is probable that the reading of the Torah, at least, originated as a synagogue service; and as the formula *bareku 'et 'adonaie*, is the call used as introduction to that reading, it would seem that this discussion confirms the tradition that the reading of the Torah in public services was introduced by Ezra, toward the middle of the fifth century or, according to the chronology now becoming increasingly prevalent, the beginning of the fourth century B.C. Cf. further my note on the subject in Jewish Quarterly Review, N. S., XXXII, 1942, pp. 394 ff.

[21] See the edition of R. Robert (Pentateuchi Versio Latina Antiquissima) based on the Lyons Manuscript, Paris, 1881, p. 324. This deviation of the text of the Haggadah

other considerations, the fact that A reproduces a reading of the Scriptural text, found otherwise only in LXX and a daughter version would indicate a very early date for the origin of that formula.

The argument for the origin of AM during the period of the Egyptian domination of Palestine is further fortified by a consideration of the pro-Egyptian influences similar to those reflected in AM, which are traceable in other works produced during that period. These works include the Book of Chronicles which apparently received its present form at this time and also the historical Psalms 78 and 105, which must also, I believe, be dated in the third century B.C.

According to the Chronicler, one of the distinguished families of Judah (traced for more than twenty generations to Judah himself) was descended from an Egyptian slave (I Chronicles 1. 35). This is, of course, especially significant in the light of the law set down in Deuteronomy 23. 8. Another Judaite family is said to be descended from the daughter of Pharaoh (ibid., 4. 18). The Chronicler does not hesitate to reproduce the story of Solomon's traffic in horses with the Egyptians (II Chronicles 1. 16; and 9. 28; cf. I Kings 10. 26). The story of the invasion of Shishak is described very sympathetically toward the Egyptians; Judah is to know "My service and the service of the kingdom of the countries" (II Chronicles 12. 8). The incident in which Necho attacked Josiah is described in a manner entirely justifying the Egyptian Pharaoh (II Chronicles 35. 20). This is in contrast to the version given in II Kings 23. 29, which indicates that Josiah was killed by treachery. The sympathy of the Chronicler for the Egyptian Pharaoh in this connection is the more significant because the occasion

---

from that of the Massoretic text was curiously overlooked by the older commentators. It was noticed, however, and commented upon, by R. Elijah Gaon of Wilna in his commentary (see, J. D. Eisenstein, Ozar Perushim ve-Ziyyurim, New York, 1920, p. 311); by Rabbi Jacob Emden in his commentary (ibid., p. 301); Malbim (in his commentary, published with the text of the Passover Haggadah, Warsaw, 1905); Rabbi Naphtali Z. J. Berlin in his commentary (published with the text of the Passover Haggadah, Warsaw, 1889); by the Yemenite scholar, Rabbi Yahya in his commentary published with the text of the Passover Haggadah (Jerusalem, 1897) by M. M. Krengel, in his commentary, published in Shaare Geulah, Cracow, 1896, see p. 59; and by other even more recent writers.

described is one which had so many parallels in the third century, when the Ptolemies and Seleucids were continually struggling for the possession of Palestine. The treatment of King Joahaz, whom "the people of the land" elected to succeed Josiah is described, too, with an eye to the Egyptian interpreter. Instead of Necho's putting the new king in chains at Riblah (II Kings 23. 34), it is said in Chronicles that Necho simply deposed Joahaz (II Chronicles 36. 3).[22]

With regard to Psalms 78 and 105, it has long been noticed [23] that the enumeration of the plagues inflicted on the Egyptians, according to both of them, varies considerably from the account in the Pentateuch. Psalm 78 omits all reference to the third, sixth, and ninth plagues (lice, boils, and darkness). Psalm 105 mentions the third plague, but omits all reference to the sixth. The author includes a reference to the ninth plague, but curiously enough mentions it before any of the others, obviously in order to separate it from the last plague, the slaying of the first born. There can be no doubt that these deviations from the story as told in Exodus are not due to mere chance; [24] the alterations bear every mark of deliberation.

[22] Regarding the date of the Book of Chronicles, particularly in its final revision, see now R. H. Pfeiffer, Introduction to the Old Testament, pp. 811 ff., who argues for a date about the middle of the third century B.C. Cf. the fascinating theory of W. F. Albright, Journal of Biblical Literature, XL, 1921, pp. 112 ff., according to which the Chronicler was none other than Ezra himself, and also Albright's review of Pfeiffer's work, ibid., LXI, 1942, p. 125. It seems probable that various strains must be distinguished in the work of the Chronicler; the earlier, forming the nucleus of the present work, may well be assigned to a comparatively early date (cf. Rothstein-Haenel, Das erste Buch der Chronik, I, pp. 70–75; 189–195; II, pp. XLIV ff.). If the late date assigned to the final redactor of Chronicles be correct, and the suggestion of Egyptian influence on him be accepted, the story of the war between Asa and the Ethiopians may be associated in some manner with the fact that the Ptolemies found the Ethiopians a source of great trial (see Bouché-Leclerq, Histoire des Lagides, I, 143). Similarly the citation of what is now Ps. 105 in I Chron. 16. 8 ff. is broken off just before the story of the Egyptian enslavement and the Exodus, perhaps to avoid having to emphasize those anti-Egyptian motifs.

[23] Cf. E. Koenig, Die Psalmen, 1927, p. 236; R. Kittel, Die Psalmen, fifth and sixth eds., 1929, pp. 264, 344.

[24] So Koenig and Kittel. A. Jirku, Die aelteste Geschichte Israels, 1917, pp. 106–114, maintains that Ps. 78 follows the enumeration of the Egyptian plagues not in accordance with our present text of the Pentateuch, but with an hypothetical source, which has been woven into the story now included in Exodus. This hypothetical source (Q) he identifies with the Document J of most higher critics; but he disagrees

It is clear that the authors of Psalms 78 and 105 omitted the mention of the sixth plague, "boils" because any reference to this peculiar malady (cf. Deuteronomy 28. 27) of the Egyptians was resented by them.[25] The Egyptians of the third century B.C. might condone the re-telling of the Jewish story of the victory of the ancient Israelites over the early Egyptians, because that, after all, concerned only a particular Pharaoh and his army. They found it more difficult to forgive a reference to a disease still prevalent among themselves.

The hesitation of the author of Psalm 78 to mention the third plague ("lice") is of course due to equally natural sensitivity on this point by the Egyptians.

The authors of both historical psalms encountered difficulty with regard to the ninth plague, that of darkness, for a reason which is perhaps more recondite. As Eduard Meyer and others have shown,[26] the Egyptian antisemites identified the God of

---

with their consensus in rejecting the usual combination of literary criteria for determining the division of the "sources"; and somewhat arbitrarily holds that the story of the plagues should be analyzed solely by the criterion of the agent to whom the plague is ascribed, — those ascribed to God Himself belong to J; those ascribed to Moses belong to E; those ascribed to Aaron belong to P. Through this change of method, Jirku avoids the difficulty that the plague of "darkness" is, according to the usual consensus, included in J, though it is omitted from Ps. 78. He thus comes to the conclusion that Ps. 78 was composed while the original Document J was still in existence as an independent source! Unfortunately for his theory, he cannot possibly make any such claim for Ps. 105, which includes the plague of "lice." He comes to the conclusion therefore that that Psalm is based on some other integration of the sources than our present Pentateuchal text. The evidence given in this article seems to me to dispose both of the possibility of such early origin of these psalms, and also of the need for such a far-fetched hypothesis to explain their deviations from the Pentateuch.

[25] See Cambridge Bible on Exod. 9. 9 for discussion of the Egyptian diseases to which the plague of "boils" might refer. Sifra Emor, parasha 3. 15, ed. Weiss 96c, interprets the word "*garab*" (Lev. 21. 20, "scabbed") as the "Egyptian lichen." So also Babli, Bekorot 41a. It is noteworthy that the Septuagint (both in Exod. and in Ps. 105) renders the word *kinnim* by "gnats" or "fleas" rather than "lice" as do the other versions and in accordance with the meaning of the word in later Jewish tradition.

[26] Ursprung u. Anfaenge d. Christentums II, 35; Tscherikower, p. 369; A. Jacoby, Archiv f. Religionswissenschaft, XXV, 1927, 265 ff. According to the latter, pp. 271 ff., the identification resulted from the confusion of the word IAO, the equivalent of YHWH in Egyptian papyri, with the Coptic word for "ass," which has a similar sound. W. F. Albright's interpretation of *harel* (meaning the altar of the Temple in Jerusalem) as associated with *'r'l* (Archaeology and the Religion of Israel, 1942, p. 151) meaning "denizen of the underworld," suggests the possibility that this fact may have contributed to the identification of the God of the Temple of Jerusalem with Seth. On the

Israel with their own Seth, the god of the wilderness, of eclipses, of storms, and of darkness. It was this identification which led to the development of the incredible, yet widespread Hellenistic myth, to the effect that the Jews worshipped an ass, and that the Innermost Shrine of the Temple in Jerusalem contained as its idol the head of an ass; for the Egyptian god Seth was frequently portrayed as an ass. The reluctance of the psalmists to refer to the plague of darkness indicates that this antisemitic identification had been made in their day. The author of Psalm 78, who is ready to omit the mention of any plague the name of which might be offensive to the Egyptians, simply passes over the ninth plague in silence. The author of Psalm 105, while mentioning the plague, does so in words which indicate that darkness is simply an instrument in the hands of God:

> "He sent darkness and it was dark,
> And they rebelled not against His word." [27] (Psalm 105. 28)

He is also careful to dissociate the plague of darkness from that of the slaying of the first-born, which followed it, according to Exodus. The slaying of the first-born was recognized as a direct visitation of God; and the fact that it was immediately preceded by the plague of darkness was doubtless offered by Egyptian interpreters as evidence that the God of Israel was their god Seth, who manifested himself through darkness. Lest any word he uttered might help give credence to this identification, the psalmist arranges the plagues so that that of darkness comes first, as far as possible from that of slaying the first-born.

The Egyptophilism reflected in these works is possibly to be associated with a more widespread spiritual influence exerted by Egypt on the Palestinian Jews during the third century B.C. Accordingly, the date of Proverbs 22. 17–24. 22 which was so obviously composed under the influence of Egyptian wisdom

---

other hand, the view that the identification of the God of the Jews with Seth was the origin of the charge of ass-worship is challenged by E. Bickermann, Monatsschrift, LXXI, 1927, pp. 171 ff.; 255 ff. See also I. Heinemann, PWRE, Suppl. V, 28 ff.

[27] If we accept the view that v. 28 is an interpolation, the omission of the plague of "darkness" would still lead to the same conclusion as that given in the text.

literature, should possibly be fixed within the period of the Ptolemaic rule over Palestine.[28] That may also apply [29] to the date of Psalm 104.

Of even greater significance is the possibility that the permeation of Egyptian wisdom into the socially higher groups was accompanied by a far different, but typical, reaction, to Egyptian teachings among the scholarly groups. Just as the impact of Aristotelian logic on the Pharisees is said to have produced the system of Rabbinic dialectic with its various rules for the hermeneutic interpretation and advancement of the Law,[30] so the impact of the Egyptian funerary practice and popular concepts may have had a share in the development of the corresponding Hasidean and Pharisaic doctrine of the Resurrection. While the Egyptian doctrine was inherently aristocratic, for only wealthy families could afford the expensive process of embalming and preserving the body, the Hasidean and Pharisaic doctrine was democratic and pietistic, extending the resurrection to the just of all classes.[31] It is usually

[28] H. J. Cadbury, Journal of Religion, IX, 1929, pp. 105 ff.; for bibliography, see ibid., note 2.

[29] See A. M. Blackman, in D. C. Simpson, The Psalmists, 1926, pp. 177 ff.

[30] Cf. W. F. Albright, From the Stone Age to Christianity, 1940, p. 274, and references there given.

[31] Both in The Pharisees, 1938, pp. 145 ff., and in Faith for Today, 1941, pp. 168 ff., I have laid great stress on the aristocratic element in the Egyptian practice, and on the essentially democratic nature of the Hasidean-Pharisaic concept. More recently, I have been led to wonder whether the Egyptian practice of mummification can properly be identified with a doctrine of the Resurrection. Professor A. D. Nock has shown that funerary customs and ideas about the after-life are not necessarily correlated (HTR, XXV, 1932, pp. 335 ff. and Journal of Biblical Literature, LX, 1941, p. 95). Moreover, the Egyptians had, together with their practice of embalming, directed toward the preservation of the body so that it might theoretically enjoy continued existence in the tomb with the offerings there deposited, also entirely different concepts of the dead men riding in the boat of the Sun-god, and being identified with Osiris in an after-life, which is in certain respects the very opposite of the Resurrection. (This dual attitude toward immortality, stressing the Resurrection of the body on the one hand, and also immortality of the soul is, of course, found also in Judaism.) Nevertheless it seems probable that the practice of mummification had its effect on the spread among the Jews, of the doctrine of Resurrection, as well as on the opposition to it, in the following manner. The Jews, impressed with the Persian concept of the Resurrection would tend to relate it to the Egyptian practice. This would have two opposite effects on the people. The purists and rigorists among the religious leaders, including the priests, would reject the Persian belief because they would associate it with the Egyptian practice, to which

assumed that the doctrine of the Resurrection made its first appearance in Judaea in the fourth century B.C.; [32] and the fact that both Palestine and Egypt were then under Persian domination certainly makes the intrusion into Judaea of Egyptian thought (together with that of the Persians) during that period quite likely. But it is more natural to assume that the full impact of Egyptian ideas on the Jews only came with the third century B.C.

In any event, the material presented indicates a widespread reaction in Palestine to the fact of Egyptian suzerainty in the third century B.C. We have already seen how this reaction led to the formulation of M. The facts here presented seem to indicate that the same circumstances led to the formulation of A. Presumably, therefore, A served as introduction to M; and they both were composed at the same time, and by the same men.

---

there had been centuries of objection. On the other hand, there would be double pressure on the populace to accept a doctrine which seems to be worldwide in its recognition. I hope to establish, on another occasion, the theory that the Sadducean negation of the Resurrection preceded the Pharisaic acceptance of the doctrine. This creation of a Sadducean dogma denying the Resurrection, to oppose the Persian doctrine of the Resurrection, might well be associated with the fact that the Persian belief was to some Jewish minds associated with the Egyptian practice. On the other hand, once non-Resurrection had become a dogma of Sadducism, it was only a question of time before the contrary belief, namely the Resurrection, became a dogma of Pharisaism. The belief in angels and demons, stemming, like that of the Resurrection from Persia, never became a really vital issue either for Pharisaism or Sadducism. Indeed except for a passing reference in Acts 23. 8 we could hardly have known that it was a controversial issue. The difference between the great emphasis of both Pharisees and Sadducees on the issue of the Resurrection, and their comparative disinterestedness in the issue of the existence of angels may derive from the fact that the Resurrection was associated with a pagan practice, namely Egyptian preservation and mummification of the body, while the doctrine of angels had no such association. For the instructive fact that the impact of the Persian ideas seems to have been felt in Judaea only after the rise of Graeco-Roman literature, see A. D. Nock in Journal of Roman Studies, XXX (1940), pp. 195–196.

[32] This is the date generally assigned to Is. 24–27; see commentaries of G. H. Box, The Book of Isaiah, 1908, p. 113; J. Skinner, The Book of the Prophet Isaiah (in Cambridge Bible), 1915, p. 217; B. Duhm, Das Buch Jesaia, 1922, p. 172, puts it in the period of John Hyrcan. His view seems, however, to have been generally rejected. W. F. Albright, op. cit., p. 269 considers the sixth century B.C. a possibility. But it seems probable that the apocalypse dates from no earlier than the beginning of the third century B.C. See R. H. Pfeiffer, Introduction to the Old Testament, p. 442.

II. The Alternative Introduction to the Passover Haggadah (B)

As already noted,[33] in using the formula, "We were Pharaoh's bondmen in Egypt," as introduction to the Passover Haggadah, modern Jewish ritual follows the prescription of the famous Babylonian scholar of the third century, Samuel of Nahardea. His contemporary, Rab, held that the recital of the story of the Exodus should begin as follows: [34]

"In the beginning, our fathers were worshippers of strange gods: but now the All-Present has brought us to His service, as it is said: [35] 'And Joshua said unto all the people, Thus saith the Lord God of Israel, Your fathers dwelt of old time beyond the River, even Terah, the father of Abraham and the father of Nahor: and they served other gods. And I took your father Abraham from beyond the River, and led him throughout all the land of Canaan, and multiplied his seed, and gave him Isaac. And I gave unto Isaac, Jacob and Esau; and I gave unto Esau, Mount Seir, to possess it; and Jacob and his children went down into Egypt. (Joshua XXIV. 2–4.)'" [36]

It is clear, however, that this formula did not originate with Rab. It would have been impossible for a scholar of the third century of the Christian Era, no matter how illustrious, to have

[33] See above, p. 292.

[34] B. Pesahim, 116a; Yer., ibid., X, 5, 37d.

[35] The introductory phrase, "In the beginning, etc.," is found as part of B in all the extant versions of the Passover Haggadah, with the exception of those published by I. Abrahams in Jewish Quarterly Review, X, 1898, pp. 44, 48, and 49; and that published by J. Greenstone in Z. f. hebraeische Bibliographie, XV, 1911, pp. 122 ff. The fragment which I. Abrahams numbers VII, on p. 47 of his article, contains the introductory phrase. In those which I. Abrahams numbers II and VII, B opens with the words, "Your fathers dwelt of old, etc." In the fragment which he numbers X, B opens with the words, "And Joshua said unto all the people, etc." According to Rab's view as quoted in Yer. Pesahim, loc. cit., B opens with the words, "Your fathers dwelt of old, etc." The text of Yerushalmi, according to our eds. reads: "Rab said, 'In the beginning one should begin (with the words): Your fathers of old, etc.'" L. Landshuth in his Maggid Mereshit, p. X, has made the interesting suggestion that the passage should be emended by placing the word *mitehilah* ("in the beginning") before the citation from Scripture. The passage as emended would therefore read: "Rab said, 'One should begin (the recital of the Passover Haggadah with the words): *In the beginning* (and then continue) *Your fathers of old*, etc.'" According to Babli, B opens with the words, "In the beginning, etc.," precisely as in our texts. Rab Natronai Gaon, in his responsum, cites a ritual in which B began with, "And Joshua said, etc.," precisely like fragment X published by I. Abrahams. See regarding this ritual, below, p. 327.

[36] For the remainder of the passage in Joshua, chap. 24, and the reason for the failure of the compiler to include it in B, see below, p. 329.

substituted a formula of his own creation for the well-established introduction, "We were Pharaoh's bondmen, etc.," unless his views were fortified by much earlier traditions. Nor can we think of any reason why Rab should have wished to substitute some other introduction for that which is prescribed in Scripture, and which, as we have seen, received its final form in the third century B.C., more than four hundred years before his time.

There is, moreover, definite evidence showing that authorities much earlier than Rab knew of an opening verse to the Haggadah, other than A. Rab's uncle, Rabbi Hiyya transmits a *baraita* [37] which reads as follows (E):

"The Torah (in prescribing the answers to be given the child during the Passover evening service) considers four types of sons: the clever son, the wicked son, the simple son, and the son unable to formulate his questions. (E1) The clever son says, 'What are the testimonies, the statutes, and the ordinances, which the Lord, our God, commanded us?' [38] (Deuter-

[37] Yerushalmi Pesahim, X, 37d, cf. Mekilta Bo, chap. 18, Fr. 22b, Horowitz-Rabin, p. 73, Lauterbach, I, 166. See further regarding this *baraita*, section IV of this article.

[38] The reading *otanu* ("us") instead of *etkem* ("you") gives force to the contrast between the utterance of the wise and the wicked sons. This reading, which is supported by the Septuagint and some texts of the Vulgate, is found in none of the other versions. It is the reading of E according to the text of Yerushalmi, loc. cit.; and the best texts of the Mekilta (see ed. Horowitz, and cf. his notes, ad loc.). It is found in the text of the Passover Haggadah of Maimonides (D); in the Darmstadt Manuscript of the Haggadah, and also in the texts cited by B. Italiener in his Die Darmstaedter Pessach Haggadah, on pp. 176, 182, 192, 194, 209, 212, 218, 223 ("corrected" on margin); (all these are said to be of German origin); p. 254 (Italian); p. 279 (Spanish); and in the edition of Haggadah ke-Minhag Teman (the Yemenite Haggadah) published by W. H. Greenburg, London, 1896, p. 19 as well as in the following texts Sa, O, P, U, Va, X. On the other hand the reading *etkem*, in accordance with the Massoretic text occurs in Siddur R. Saadia, the commentary of R. Isaiah di Trani, (see Shaare Geulah, Cracow, 1896, p. 17) Shibbale Ha-Leket, Orhot Hayyim, Kol Bo, the following Genizah fragments of the Adler collection at the Jewish Theological Seminary 2857, f. 13v.; 2935, f. 4a; 3288, f. 11r.; (there are none with the alternative reading); and the following other texts E, F, G, H, I, J, K (XII, XIII) M, Qa, R, S, Sb, Sc, Sd, T, Ta, Tb, Tc, W, and in the texts cited by B. Italiener, op. cit., pp. 170, 199, 232 (of German origin); p. 249 (Italian); p. 263 (Oriental); p. 269 (French); p. 275 (Spanish). The word is entirely omitted in the manuscript described by Italiener, op. cit., p. 243. See regarding the difference D. Hoffmann, in Magazin f. d. Wissenschaft d. Judenthums 13, 1886, p. 193, and Bet Vaad Lahakamim, I, 1902-03, p. 16; and cf. also S. Lieberman, Hayerushalmi Kifeshuto, I, 1, 1934, p. 520, and other articles, cited below, note 108.

onomy 6. 20). Do thou therefore teach him the laws of the Passover ritual, 'It is forbidden to end the Passover meal with entertainment.'[39] (E2) The wicked son says, 'What mean ye by this service?' (Exodus 12. 26). By saying, 'ye' instead of 'we,' he has withdrawn himself from the community, and has rejected a basic principle of Judaism. Do thou therefore reply to him sharply, 'It is because of that which the Lord did for me, when I came forth from Egypt.' (Exodus 13. 8). (The Scriptures say) *for me*, carrying the implication *not for thee;* for if the wicked son had been there, he would not have been redeemed. (E3) The simple son says, 'What is this?' (Exodus 13. 14). Thou shalt say to him, 'By the strength of hand the Lord brought us out from Egypt, from the house of bondage.' (Ibid.) (E4) As for the son who cannot formulate questions, do thou begin for him, even as it is written, 'And thou shalt tell thy son in that day, saying: It is because of that which the Lord did for me when I came forth from Egypt.'"

It is important to note that Rabbi Hiyya cites all the passages in the Pentateuch which refer to the questions and answers regarding the Passover, except one: namely, Deuteronomy 6. 21, which forms the basis for the answer most commonly used! This omission is astonishing, until we recollect that none of the other explanations of the Passover suggested in the Pentateuch were subject to controversy. Rabbi Hiyya could proceed calmly to discuss their relative merits, and the occasions to which they were especially suitable. Rabbi Hiyya could not use the reply in Deuteronomy 6. 21, apparently, because he held that that reply should *not* be used on any occasion. The aversion to the particular reply constituting A apparently signifies that the use of A was a matter of difference of ritual. Either Rabbi Hiyya declined to take part in the controversy, or he sympathized with those who objected to A. As we know that his nephew and devoted disciple, Rab, objected to A, we may rightly assume that this view was also taken by Rabbi Hiyya himself.

[39] See Additional Note C for the meaning and varying orthography and pronunciation of the word *afikoman* (translated here "entertainment"), according to the different texts of the Mishna, the Passover Haggadah, etc.

We can, however, show that the difference of opinion regarding the use of A arose in ages much earlier than that of Rabbi Hiyya. The Mishna, Pesahim (10. 4) after enumerating the questions to be asked, describes the father's reply in the following words: "According to the understanding of the son, his father instructs him. He begins with the disgrace and ends with the glory; and he expounds from *A wandering Aramaean was my father* . . . until he finishes the whole section."

The discussion between Rab and Samuel regarding the opening of the Haggadah is presented in the Talmud as difference in the interpretation to be placed on the words, "He begins with the disgrace." According to Rab, the disgrace referred to is the idol-worship of the ancestors of the Hebrews; according to Samuel it is their bondage in Egypt. But the question must arise, why was the compiler of the Mishna so inexplicit? He cites verbatim the questions which the son asks. Why, then, did he not specifically quote the reply of the father? The answer must be that the compiler of the Mishna, in this instance as in others, declined to take sides in a controversy regarding different rituals, which were regarded as equally satisfactory. It happens that both A and B might be described as "beginning with the disgrace and ending with the glory." A opens with Israel in bondage, and ends with Israel redeemed by God; B opens with the ancestors of Israel worshipping idols, and ends with their worship of God.

But if the compiler of the Mishna intentionally used an indefinite expression, because he knew of the two variant forms of the Haggadah, A and B, that fact fixes the date of the origin of B much earlier than Rab; for it can be shown that the part of the Mishna containing this passage was compiled before the destruction of the Temple in the year 70.[40]

This argument thus takes us back to Temple times for the origin of B as well as A. We have already seen that there is other evidence pointing to the third century B.C. for the origin of A; the present discussion would seem to make the argument conclusive.

[40] See D. Hoffmann, Die Erste Mischna (Beilage z. Jahresbericht d. Rabbiner-Seminars zu Berlin, 1881–82), p. 8; also Zebi Carl, Pesahim, Lwow, 1925, 93 ff.

For the origin of B, we must now turn to the evidence afforded by literary criticism. The discussion of the origin of AM has shown the importance which was attached in early times to the Passover service as a means to influence popular opinion. The success which attended the use of AM for the purposes it was intended to serve, doubtless strengthened the tendency to use the Passover service for propaganda purposes. In determining the date of B it will be helpful to inquire whether B could have been of any use from this point of view.

B stresses three basic ideas: (1) the antiquity of Israel; (2) its origin in Mesopotamia; (3) its distinctiveness as a religious group. In all three respects, its attitude toward Judaism is, with a varying degree of emphasis, different from that of AM. A might be interpreted at least as associating the Jews with an Egyptian background.[41] As we have seen, M incontinently transforms the verse, "My father was a Syrian," into "The Syrian (i.e., Laban) sought to destroy my father." Opposing both A and M, B reverts to the spirit which animates the literal meaning of Deuteronomy 26. 5, and definitely traces the origins of Israel to the Syrians. The origin of Israel, according to this work, is to be sought, further, not in the Exodus, marking the emergence of the nation from bondage, but in the call to Abraham, by which he turned from idolatry to the worship of the One God. Obviously this is a strange note to strike on the Passover when the Exodus from Egypt, as an historical event, was being celebrated. It is particularly curious to insist that the Passover celebration open on this note. The formulation of such a passage, with its obvious political overtones, bears every mark of deliberate apologetics and propaganda.

Propaganda for what purpose? First, to controvert the Egyptian claim that Israel came into existence only at a comparatively late period; and to insist, in the manner used so emphatically by Josephus in his apologetics of a later age, that Israel was an ancient people.[42] This insistence on the an-

[41] See above, note 15.

[42] Schuerer, III, 546, and references there given; M. Friedlaender, Geschichte der Juedischen Apologetik, 1903, 349 ff.; P. Krueger, Philo u. Josephus als Apologeten d. Judentums, 1906, 62 ff.; J. Bergmann, Jued. Apologetik in Neutestamentlichen Zeitalter, 1908, p. 146; and article, Apologetik u. Apologeten, in Encyc. Judaica (1928).

tiquity of Israel was, of course, nothing more than a particular example of the general tendency of Hellenistic historiography. It was, in fact, the reaction of Jewish writers and thinkers to the propaganda issuing from the court circles of the Ptolemies and the Seleucids. Both of these dynasties were trying to establish some ideational basis for their claim to the loyalty of their subjects; and, in doing so, did not hesitate to re-write history and even foster new philosophical and religious concepts.[43] Thus the Ptolemies endeavored to obtain recognition for themselves as rightful successors of the Pharaohs, and therefore as Pharaohs. Like the Seleucids, they unblushingly invited recognition of themselves as gods.[44] In addition to these efforts to win personal loyalties, the Hellenistic kings had to foster new types of patriotism among their subjects. This was perhaps more difficult for the Seleucids than for the Ptolemies, for unlike Egypt, the Seleucid Empire was a conglomeration of national units, rather than itself a unit. But even in Egypt, national pride had to be stimulated to the utmost, in order to maintain the courage of the people and their willingness to submit to the inevitable burdens of almost continuous warfare.

The eagerness to foment Egyptian patriotism was reflected in the effort of Egyptian historiographers to describe their country as the mother of all culture, including the Jewish and the Greek, and as the most ancient home of all civilization.

The Jewish writers, rendered oversensitive perhaps by the obvious weakness of their people in the face of the vast empires, considered these declarations of the antiquity of the Egyptians and the originality of their culture, a challenge to the dignity of Israel. This sensitivity was emphasized by the Hellenistic tendency to attach great importance to the real or imputed wisdom of Oriental peoples, and to revel in rather fabulous ascriptions of antiquity. It was out of this situation that there

[43] See above, note 15 and references there given.

[44] A. Bouché-Leclerq, Histoire des Lagides, 1907, I, 232; ibid., Histoire des Séleucides, 1913, p. 465; E. Bikerman, Inst. des Séleucides, pp. 236 ff.; E. R. Goodenough, The Political Philosophy of Hellenistic Kingship, in Yale Classical Studies, I (1928), pp. 55 ff.; see also P. Heichelheim, Wirtschaftsgeschichte d. Altertums, I, 651; II, p. 1119.

arose the continuous literary debate regarding the relative antiquity of Jewish and other cultures, as well as of the Jewish and other peoples. This discussion culminated in the endeavor of Josephus to defend the Jews and Judaism through writing his Antiquities and through his bitter diatribe against the Egyptian writers in his Contra Apionem.[45] "In my history of our Antiquities," Josephus writes with emphasis, "I have, I think, made sufficiently clear to any who may peruse that work the extreme antiquity of our Jewish race, the purity of the original stock, and the manner in which it established itself in the country we occupy today. That history embraces a period of five thousand years." He is at great pains to explain to the Graeco-Roman world why, despite the early origin of Israel, none of the earliest Greek writers refers to this people. Now while Josephus is the first writer who so explicitly states his purpose in emphasizing the antiquity of Israel, there can be no doubt that the motif actuated many writers before his day. If, for example, we read the Book of Chronicles *after* studying the fragments of Hecataeus [46] and Manetho,[47] we notice at once why the history of the Temple and its related institutions, which is the main subject of the Chronicler's interest, begins with a list of generations from Adam. The Egyptophilism of the Chronicler, which we have noticed above,[48] did not of course

[45] Contra Apionem, I, 1 ff.

[46] See Reinach, op. cit. [47] Josephus, Contra Apionem, see above, note 7.

[48] See p. 298. One of the purposes of the historical psalms, 78, 105, and 106 may have been to overcome the tendency toward self-depreciation by the Jews under the stress of the calumnies spread about them in the Egyptian and Hellenistic world by the anti-Jewish writers. Perhaps the fear of self-depreciation by Jews may also be in part responsible for the reference to the Patriarchs at the beginning of the Amidah, the first benediction of which was probably formulated in pre-Maccabean times. (Jewish Quarterly Review, N. S., XVI, 1925, 41 ff.) Ben Sira's "Praise of the Fathers of Old" (Ecclus. Chap. 44) attains a new significance when it is regarded as a reply to detractors of the Israelites as a people of recent origin. The apologetic tendency of the Jewish writers under the Ptolemaic rule is perhaps most clearly to be noticed in Ps. 87. The date of this Psalm seems to be fixed by its reference to Egypt under the cypher *Rahab*, as though the author sought to avoid giving offense to the Imperial rulers. The purpose of the psalmist is to show that Judaea has produced more genuinely great men than any of her neighbors. He says, "Glorious things are spoken of thee, O city of God. Selah. 'I will make mention of Rahab and Babylonia'" (i.e. the Seleucid empire) "'among them that know Me; Behold Philistia and Tyre, with Ethiopia; This one was born there.' But of Zion it shall be said: 'This man and that was born in her; and the

extend to any depreciation of Israel. The Chronicler therefore devotes the first nine chapters of his book to tracing the genealogies of the leading Israelite families. His history begins with the advent of King David; but he demonstrates that the origins of Israel are to be sought in the origin of the human race itself.

This apologetic effort was carried on by other writers, both in Alexandria and in Palestine. The re-formulation of Jewish history by Demetrius and Eupolemus is well-known.[49] Less attention has been given to the equally significant apologetics, which emanated from Palestine, emphasizing the "Jewish contribution to civilization." The author of the Book of Jubilees [50] which, it now seems probable, was composed in the decades immediately preceding the Maccabean uprising,[51] is at great pains to stress the rôle of Abraham in the development of the technical civilization of the world. It was not enough that he was a teacher of monotheism; for to a part of the Jewish world, following in this respect the pagan Hellenists, monotheism did not, apparently, constitute an important factor in human civilization. But everyone knew the value attaching to machines and inventions; and so it became a very significant fact in the historiography of the Book of Jubilees to ascribe to Abraham the invention of a particularly efficient plough; just as the Alexandrian writers tried to increase the stature of Moses by making him the originator of Egyptian culture,[52] and even Philo traces the origin of Greek philosophy to Moses.[53]

In the further effort to increase the self-respect of the Jews, and to evoke reverence for them among the materialistic,

---

Most High Himself doth establish her.' The Lord shall count in the register of the peoples: 'This one was born there.' Selah. And singers, like dancers," (so to be interpreted, in accordance with Kittel and Koenig, ad loc.) "shout: All my fountains are in thee."

[49] E. Schuerer, Gesch. d. jued. Volkes, 1909, III, pp. 472 ff.

[50] Jubilees 11. 19 ff. In Jub. 12. 27, we are told how Abraham learned the Hebrew language, which was obviously foreign to him in Mesopotamia. Cf. I Macc. 12. 21, which claims that the Spartans are descended from Abraham.

[51] See Appendix to this article.

[52] Schuerer, op. cit., pp. 477 ff.

[53] See Quis re. div. heres 43. 214, ed. Wendland-Cohen-Reiter, III, p. 48; Quod omnis probus liber sit 8. 57, ibid., VI, p. 16.

pagan Hellenists, the writer of the Book of Jubilees[54] transforms the Hebrew patriarchs into efficient warriors; and tells how long before their descent into Egypt the Israelites waged wars and won great victories.

This tendency is carried forward in the Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs,[55] and also in the later Rabbinic midrash.

It was entirely natural that this apologetic tendency should also affect the formulation of the Passover Haggadah.

But the desire to emphasize the antiquity of the Jewish people, clearly reflected in B, is evidently supplemented by another desire, to associate the Jews with the Mesopotamians. This could have only one purpose, pleasing Seleucid rulers.[56]

After the Seleucids came into control of Palestine in the year 198 B.C., it was as necessary to placate them and to induce docility to them in the populace as it had been necessary to placate the Ptolemies and to make the populace subservient to *them* when they were in control. The Seleucids were even more eager than the Ptolemies had been to inculcate in the Palestinian people a sense of loyalty to themselves, and hostility to their enemies and rivals.[57] The Seleucids doubtless looked to

[54] See Jub. 34. 4 ff.; Test. Judah, chaps. 3–7. The wars between Egypt and Canaan, described in Jub. 46. 6 ff., and alluded to in Test. Simeon 8. 2, are strongly reminiscent of those between the Seleucids and the Ptolemies. Much of the material bearing on the apologetic tendencies of the Book of Jubilees and the Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs, presented by Friedlaender, op. cit., pp. 161–187 remains relevant, though his conception of these books as products of the diaspora can hardly be accepted. The stories of Artapanus, recording the instruction which Abraham gave to the Egyptian rulers in astrology, and making Moses the virtual founder of Egyptian civilization, follows the same line of thought (op. cit., pp. 477–478). The close relationship between the Palestinian and the Egyptian literature of apologetics demonstrates how well the Palestinians, even at an early date, were aware of the nature of the Egyptian polemics against them. It is therefore entirely natural that the leaders of the Jews, doubtless far better acquainted with antisemitic literature than the masses, should seek to counteract it; particularly at the Passover festival, which drew so many Jews from the diaspora to Jerusalem.

[55] Cf. Test. Judah, chaps. 3 ff.

[56] For Syrian traditions associating the Jews with Syrian origin, cf. I. Heinemann, PWRE, Suppl. V, 23. See Reinach, Textes d'auteurs grecs et romains relatifs au Judaïsme, 1895, pp. 79 (Nicholas of Damascus) and pp. 251 ff. (Trogus Pompeius).

[57] The need felt by the Seleucid government for national unity and the jealousy felt regarding Jewish loyalties to Egypt, were doubtless, finally, one of the determining factors in the religious persecution inaugurated by Antiochus IV; concerning which see below. Cf. E. Meyer, II, 143 ff.; 166; Heinemann, PWRE, Suppl. V, 5.

the ecclesiastical leaders of the land to serve them, precisely as the earlier high priests had served the former rulers. The influence of Egypt on Palestine had been profound; there was a strong pro-Egyptian group in the Palestinian community.[58] Palestine was a distant outpost of the Seleucid empire; and so little were the Seleucids able to control Palestine, even after their conquest, that for a number of years the pro-Egyptian landowner, Hyrcan, son of Tobiah, held his estates in Transjordan, openly proclaiming his Egyptian sympathies, and perhaps receiving Egyptian support.[59]

The very weakness of the hold of the Seleucids on Palestine obviously made it the more necessary for the pro-Seleucid Jews to avoid saying or doing anything which might seem to be disloyal; and stimulated the interest of the Seleucids in the position taken by various Palestinian Jewish leaders. The whole situation therefore was one which called for the formulation of an introduction to the Passover Haggadah, containing the ideas inculcated in B, namely that Israel arose in great antiquity; and that it was an offshoot of Syria rather than Egypt.[60]

While it is probable that so fundamental a change in the ritual as the substitution of B for A would have come about, in all probability, only as a measure intended to please the imperial Seleucid government; once the change was made, it is obvious that all self-respecting Jews would prefer B to A, because of B's insistence on the antiquity of Israel. Hence, it came about, doubtless, that long after the Seleucid power in Palestine had disappeared, B was generally recited; and that A was retained only in the most distant outposts of Babylonia, like Nahardea, the home of the teacher, Samuel, where the influence of the change introduced in the Temple service was not

[58] See above, note 7.

[59] For the inherent weakness of the Seleucid kingdom, see E. Meyer, Bluete u. Niedergang d. Hellenismus in Asien, 1925, p. 46, and now M. Rostovtzeff, The Social and Economic History of the Hellenistic World, 1941, I, 473 ff.

[60] It is noteworthy that this relationship with Syria is emphatically stressed in Test. Judah 10. 1; and Jubilees 34. 20, 21; 37. 1. The fact that Levi is described as marrying a daughter of Aram, and Tamar, the ancestress of the Davidic dynasty, is also so described, indicates the significance which these authors attached to the close relationship between Israel and Aram. Marriage with Canaanite women is described in both works as a serious offense (see Jubilees 20. 4; 25. 1–3; 27. 8; Test. Judah 14. 6).

felt.[61] Sura, being nearer Palestine, had apparently adopted the changed form of ritual.[62] Perhaps this was done under the influence of Rab, founder of the Academy of Sura, who rejected A (as we have already noticed) and insisted that B alone was the appropriate beginning for the Passover Haggadah.

While these considerations seem to indicate the period 198–167 B.C. as the time of the origin of B as part of the Haggadah, it is possible to delimit the period more narrowly, by considering carefully the series of epochal events, and the shifting of Seleucid and Jewish policies, which characterized that age.

The first public policy enunciated by Antiochus III after his conquest in 198 B.C. was intended to win the friendship of the people by offering them a larger measure of autonomy.[63] The charter issued by Antiochus III to the Jews [64] recognized the Sanhedrin, as well as the rights of the scribes to be members of the Sanhedrin, and gave important guarantees to the Temple and the community.[65] It seems probable that the High

[61] See note 34.

[62] The customs of Sura frequently followed those of Palestine and opposed those of other parts of Babylonia. Indeed, this distinction was one of the main reasons for the differences between the academies of Sura and Pumbedita in their interpretations of Judaism (see L. Ginzberg, Ginze Schechter, 1929, II, 508, and B. M. Lewin, Methiboth, Jerusalem, 1933, Introduction, pp. i–v).

[63] Cambridge Ancient History, VII, 164; Oesterley and Robinson, A History of Israel, II, 1932, 208–209; Eduard Meyer, Ursprung u. Anfaenge d. Christentums, II, 126; E. Bickermann, Der Gott d. Makkabaeer, 1937, pp. 51 ff.; cf. also his article in Revue d. Études Juives, C, 1935, pp. 4 ff.

[64] Josephus, Antiquities, XII, 129 ff. (3, 3). The edict was, naturally, addressed to Ptolemy, one of the Seleucid officials. For the authenticity of the document, see works of Bickermann, cited in preceding note; as well as the following discussions, H. Willrich, Juden u. Griechen, 1895, 42–43; and his Urkundfaelschung in d. hellenistisch-juedischen Literatur, 1924, 18 ff.; B. Niese, Gesch. d. Griechischen u. Makedonischen Staaten, 1899, II, 579; A. Buechler, Die Tobiaden u. die Oniaden, 1899, pp. 143 ff.; E. R. Bevan, The House of Seleucus, 1902, II, 166, note 4; E. Meyer, Ursprung u. Anfaenge d. Christentums, 1921, II, 127, note 2; Tscherikower, 122 ff. The general trend of modern scholarship seems now to be in favor of the acceptance of the document as genuine.

[65] The privileges granted Jerusalem by Antiochus III were probably from his point of view moderate (see Bickermann, in Revue d. Études Juives, loc. cit., p. 34). But they were of great importance from the point of view of the scholars, in that they recognized for the first time the "scribes of the Temple" and gave a special place, too, to the "sacred singers." Under the first group, we must recognize the *sopherim* or the predecessors of the later Pharisaic Scribes; under the second group, undoubtedly, the Levites (see, further, my discussion of the subject, in The Pharisees, 1938, II, 581). For the

Priest under whom this charter was granted was Simeon the Righteous. Apparently he and the leading scribes of Jerusalem had taken the side of Antiochus in his struggle against the Ptolemies. The charter of liberties which was granted them was more than a token of his gratitude; it was also an effort to obtain their support for the future. The conquest of Palestine was only one step in the expansion of the Seleucid empire; the next step was to integrate the little western country into that empire. It was apparently the belief of Antiochus III, that by granting the Judaites a large measure of autonomy, and by giving recognition to their scribes, he would be able to obtain loyalty and devotion in Palestine for his empire.

After Simeon died, the Syrian government suddenly seems to have realized, however, that it had underestimated the strength of the pro-Egyptian sentiment in Palestine; and that the autonomous powers it had granted the Jewish leaders might interfere with rather than advance, the process of integrating the Jewish community into the Seleucid empire. This apprehension was based on the persistence of the pro-Egyptian faction in Palestine; and the adherence of Onias II, the son of Simeon the Righteous, who became High Priest soon after his father's death, to this pro-Egyptian faction.[66]

The fact is that the Jewish aristocracy was divided in its loyalties between Egypt and Syria; and for urgent reasons. Trade between Palestine and Egypt already considerable in the Persian period, had been vastly stimulated under the Ptolemaic dominion, as the Zenon papyri now show,[67] and as

---

identity of Simeon the Righteous and his date, see G. F. Moore, in Jewish Studies in Memory of Israel Abrahams, 1927, 348 ff. For identical conclusions based on somewhat different materials, see N. Krochmal, More Nebuche Ha-Zeman, ed. Rawidowicz, 1924, p. 65.

[66] The relationship of the Hellenistic movement in Palestine to the international situation has been recognized by a number of writers. Perhaps it has been most emphatically described and most clearly formulated by E. Taeubler, in his essay, Staat und Umwelt: Palaestina in der hellenistisch-roemischen Zeit, in Tyche, historische Studien, 1926, pp. 128–129.

[67] In Cambridge Ancient History, VII, 130 ff.; Rostovtzeff, The Social and Economic History of the Hellenistic World, I, 256, 293, 384 f.; J. Toutain, The Economic Life of the Ancient World, 1930, 160 ff.; and V. Tscherikower, Palestine under the Ptolemies (Mizraim, IV–V, 1937, pp. 15 ff.).

might have been assumed from scattered Talmudic references.[68] For this reason, the leading landowners and the international merchants of Jerusalem in the third century B.C. were as pro-Egyptian as their predecessors in the eighth and seventh centuries B.C. had been.[69] Even after the Seleucid conquest of Palestine, many retained their pro-Egyptian sympathies, and hoped that a restoration of the Egyptian domination would bring about a restoration of the Egyptian export and import traffic, which the conquest of the Seleucids had reduced, if not completely interrupted.

On the other hand, there was apparently a considerable group among affluent Judaites who apparently no longer cherished any hope of the restoration of Egyptian dominion. They, therefore, looked for the expansion of their commerce not to Egypt, but to Palestine itself. They were gravely concerned, therefore, because the political and religious divisions of the country impeded the development of this internal commerce. The chief divisions, which threatened Palestinian commercial unity, were those between the Judaites and the Samaritans, on the one hand; and the Jewish and the Greek cities, on the other.

The conflict between Judaea and Samaria dated back, of course, to the very beginning of the Second Commonwealth.[70] It had become exacerbated under Nehemiah, who, in building the walls of Jerusalem and establishing it as metropolitan trade center, had aroused the opposition not only of the Samaritans, themselves, but also of Tobiah, the Ammonite, and Geshem, the Arab chieftain. These opponents of Nehemiah, it now becomes clear, sided with the Samaritans not because they preferred Samaria to Judaea, but because they feared the effect of any schism in the country on their interests.[71] The situation

[68] Tosefta Makshirin 3. 4, ed. Zuckermandel, p. 675. For the very important historical economic significance of this record, see L. Ginzberg, Mekomah shel ha-halakah behokmat yisrael, 1931, pp. 6 ff.; and cf. S. Lieberman, Tosefet Rishonim, IV, 1939, p. 115.

[69] See L. Finkelstein, The Pharisees, I, p. 424.

[70] Ezra 4. 2, 9, *et al.* For a general discussion of the relations of the Samaritans and the returning Judaites to each other in these early times, see Oesterley and Robinson, A History of Israel, II, pp. 142 ff.; and CAH, VI, pp. 181 ff.

[71] Neh. 2. 19 f.; 3. 33; 4. 1 ff.; 6. 1 ff.; 13. 4 ff. See W. F. Albright, From the Stone

was further aggravated in the course of time, both through the widening schism between Samaria and Judaea, and doubtless also through the economic distress caused by the political dislocation, incidental to the wars of the third century B.C. and the interference with Egyptian trade following on the Seleucid conquest of Palestine.[72]

The second division interfering with Palestinian trade had developed only in Hellenistic times, with the growth of the Greek population in the land. The Ptolemies and the Seleucids[73] had stimulated the development of Hellenistic settlements in Palestine, which by virtue of their status as Greek cities, were separated from the Jewish community, economically, as well as politically, culturally and religiously.[74] V. Tscherikower[75] has shown how important the re-integration of these cities into the Jewish economy was for the leading Palestinian merchants.

Among those who accepted the Seleucid domination of Palestine as an irremediable situation, there might thus be two different approaches to the economic problem resulting from it. The high priestly families, whose social status derived from the Temple, naturally resented any effort to diminish the importance of Jerusalem, though they might welcome whatever steps could be taken to bring about an integration between

---

Age to Christianity, p. 248; Oesterley and Robinson, op. cit., pp. 153 ff. Nehemiah naturally makes the sympathy of so many neighbors of Israel for the Samaritans seem sheer perverseness. But surely the re-establishment of Jerusalem as the religious center of Judaea, and as its metropolis, did threaten the established economic habits of the Transjordanians as well as of the Samaritans, and was a peril against which both groups might be expected to unite. It is interesting to note that the later Tobiads, like the one who was Nehemiah's contemporary, had close relations with the Samaritans (see Josephus, Antiquities, XII, 168 (4. 3); and cf. V. Tscherikower, Ha-Yehudim veha-Yevanim, 1931, pp. 170 ff.).

[72] See M. Rostovtzeff, The Social and Economic History of the Hellenistic World, II, 696; cf. ibid., I, 541.

[73] For the development of Egyptian-Palestinian commerce under the Ptolemies, see M. Rostovtzeff in Cambridge Ancient History, VII, 191 ff.; Tscherikower, pp. 150 ff.; ibid., Palestine under the Ptolemies, pp. 43 ff.; W. L. Westerman, Upon Slavery in Ptolemaic Egypt, 1929, p. 59; C. C. Edgar, Zenon Papyri in the University of Michigan Collection, 1931, pp. 17 f.

[74] Regarding the Greek cities, see Schuerer, Geschichte[4], II, pp. 95 ff.; Tscherikower, pp. 66 ff.; A. H. M. Jones, The Cities of the Eastern Roman Provinces, 1937, pp. 228 ff.; and V. Tscherikower, Palestine under the Ptolemies (Mizraim, IV–V, 1937), pp. 43–45.

[75] Ha-Yehudim veha-Yevanim, pp. 205 ff.

Jerusalem and the Greek cities. A much more radical remedy would naturally occur to the great commercial leaders who did not have the high priestly associations and responsibilities, or any special feeling of loyalty to Jerusalem. Their desire would be to bring about not merely a closer association between the Jewish and the Greek settlements, and thus destroy the more recent trade barriers; they would also naturally like to put an end to the ancient quarrel between Jerusalem and Samaria, through some compromise arrangement. It is entirely intelligible that the descendants of Tobiah the Ammonite, the opponent of Nehemiah, should seek to destroy Jerusalem's claim to being the sole sanctuary; and thus to lay the foundation for a rapprochement between Judah and Samaria.

These conflicting interests among the Palestinian aristocrats apparently brought about a series of fraternal conflicts; or perhaps it is more precise to say, that fraternal rivalries and jealousies sought expression in the imperial conflicts between Egypt and Syria, as well as in the divergent interests of the Palestinian traders. Thus while Onias II, the High Priest, was pro-Egyptian, his younger brother, Jason, was pro-Seleucid. Of the members of the leading lay family of Judaea, the Tobiads — the descendants of Tobiah the Ammonite[76] — the elder brothers were pro-Seleucid; the youngest, Hyrcan, pro-Egyptian.

There was apparently this difference, however, between the pro-Seleucid policy of Jason and that of the older Tobiads; Jason wished to adopt a policy which, preserving the sanctity of the Temple of Jerusalem, would destroy the economic barriers between Jewish and Greek cities in Palestine. The Tobiads, as becomes clear from the sequel, really sought to destroy what they considered the basic barrier to Palestinian unity, the claim of the Temple of Jerusalem to a unique status.

There is evidence of a further conflict regarding the status of the Zadokide high priesthood. The claim of the Zadokides to sole hegemony in the Temple is challenged in the Book of Chronicles, which seems to lay the foundation for a demand that a representative of the Ittamar priesthood be made as-

[76] See Additional Note D for further discussion of the associations of the Tobiads, and a bibliography.

sociate to the Zadokide high priest.[77] There is also evidence that long before the rise of Menelaus to the high priesthood, efforts were being made by the Tobiads to seize this office. A reflection of the need felt by the Zadokide to defend their prerogative may be discerned in Ben Sira's passionate plea on behalf of the dynasty;[78] and even more in the account given in the Book of Chronicles of the dire punishment suffered by King Uzziah, who was not an Aaronid, when he dared usurp the high priestly office.[79] The clearest evidence of the conflict is naturally to be found in the course of historical events, which will now be described.

In the first stage of the struggle between the pro-Seleucid and the pro-Egyptian parties in Jerusalem, the pro-Seleucids, including Jason, the brother of Onias, and the elder Tobiads, acted as a unit. They were, doubtless, all as eager as the Seleucids themselves to stress the kinship between the Jews and the Syrians, and to strengthen every possible recollection of the hostility of Israel and Egypt. It was for this reason that the pro-Seleucids so strongly urged that the citizens of Jerusalem be declared Antiochenes, i.e., citizens of the Syrian capital of Antioch; and their city be made into a Greek *polis*, governed after the manner of a Greek city, and having close associations with the various Greek communities in Palestine.[80]

[77] See Van Rad, Das Geschichtsbild d. Chronistischen Werkes, 1930, pp. 85 ff.; and J. W. Rothstein–J. Haenel, Kommentar zum ersten Buch der Chronik, 1927, p. 429. It is noteworthy that the Chronicler does not regard Zadok but Azariah, son of Johanan, as the first priest of the Solomonic Temple (I Chron. 5. 36); and that he places great emphasis on the line of Ittamar and of Ebiatar, the rivals of the house of Zadok.

[78] Cf. the high praise bestowed by Ben Sira on Phineas, the ancestor of the Zadokides (Ecclus. 45. 23 ff.) and the blessing to God for having chosen the "sons of Zadok to be priests" (ibid., 51. 12, Hebrew text).

[79] II Chron. 26. 16 ff.

[80] The precise meaning to be attached to the phrase, "to register (*anagrapsai*) the Jerusalemites as Antiochenes" (II Macc. 4. 10) is not clear (see with regard to it the discussions in Schuerer, Gesch. d. Volkes Israel[4], II, 145, note 205; Tscherikower, pp. 131 ff.; E. Bickermann, Der Gott der Makkabaeer, p. 59, n. 1; Jones, Cities of the Eastern Roman Empire, p. 252; and The Greek City from Alexander to Justinian, pp. 17, 111; Cambridge Ancient History, VIII, p. 503). But the general purpose of the measure was unquestionably to break down the distinction between Jerusalem as a Temple City, and the Greek cities. For a picture of the relation of the Greek cities as they affected the economy of the countries through which they were scattered, see

The dissatisfaction of the Syrian government with Onias II was expressed on a number of occasions; and once almost led to the intrusion of a Syrian general into the Temple itself. It was not until 175 B.C. when Antiochus IV, Epiphanes, became king, that the Syrian government decided to remove Onias II. It took this action on the suggestion and with the encouragement of Jason, the pro-Seleucid brother of Onias, who coveted the high priestly office for himself. II Maccabees (4. 8) records that Jason promised the Syrian government a considerable increase in the annual tax paid by Judaea; but we may be certain that this offer was not the only, or even the primary, consideration in the change of high priests through governmental control.[81] The Seleucid government would not have endangered its domination of so important and so distant an outpost as Palestine through the appointment of an unsatisfactory high priest, no matter what sums were offered it for this purpose. The government did not object, naturally, to receiving payment from the ambitious and covetous Jason for doing what it believed to be to its interest from the general political point of view.

F. M. Heichelheim, Wirtschaftsgeschichte d. Altertums, I, pp. 532 ff.; and also pp. 637 ff. From the point of view of the Hellenists, the recognition of their group in Jerusalem as Antiochenes was simply giving political expression to an existing cultural fact. They were Antiochenes in spirit. As A. D. Nock has shown, in his St. Paul (1938), p. 94, "The notion that the essence of being a Greek was cultural rather than racial had been voiced earlier; but it was now (in the Hellenistic age) translated into effective reality."

[81] It seems to me curious to suppose that nothing more was involved in the appointment of Jason, and later of Menelaus, than an increased tribute or a bribe. It is true that an ancient oriental court would concern itself very seriously with such considerations (E. R. Bevan, The House of Seleucus, II, 169). Nevertheless, on the eve of war with Egypt, the Seleucid king must certainly have taken a careful measure of the need of integrating his dominion; this is especially clear in the light of subsequent events. Perhaps Bevan's failure to recognize this is due to his assumption that the Jews took the initiative in the matter of the Hellenization of Jerusalem. Obviously, this was true, so far as *formal* communication was concerned; it may be assumed, however, that the initiative of the Jews was in this instance, as in other imperialisms, stimulated from above. Cf. Cambridge Ancient History, VIII, pp. 502, 507. For the question of the extent to which the Seleucid government took the initiative with regard to the Hellenization of the Jews, cf. A. Momigliano, in Atti della R. Accademia d. scienze di Torino, LXVII, 1931–32, p. 195; A. D. Nock, Conversion, 1933, p. 35; E. Bickermann, Der Gott d. Makkabaeer, pp. 117 ff.; and the review of the book by I. Heinemann, in Monatsschrift, LXXXII, 1938, 147 ff.

Jason did not, however, remain in office very long. Before he had completed four years of service as high priest he was himself removed, at the instigation of one Menelaus who, though probably not an Aaronid, succeeded Jason as high priest (II Maccabees 4. 24).[82] This removal of Jason is represented, again, as being the result of nothing more than a generous offer of increased taxes to the Syrian overlords. But surely, Menelaus must have used some other arguments, even more potent than a lavish payment to the government, in order to obtain its consent for the removal of the man who had so recently been appointed high priest. We must assume that the real reason for the removal of Jason was the fact that, despite the charges of Hellenization which are brought against him, he was considered by the Tobiads and the Syrian government, too moderate in his efforts to integrate the Jews into the Syrian state.[83] His derelictions, even according to the record of his opponents, consisted only of the introduction of certain externalities of Greek life into Jerusalem (II Maccabees 4. 11). He obviously remained devoted to the Temple service, and observed its regulations and those of Jewish ritual in general, with the utmost care. The failure of II Maccabees to mention any definite derelictions of Jason in Jewish observance offers ample evidence that Jason did not transgress the Mosaic or traditional law, save in his introduction of the Greek gymnasium, and the ways associated with that institution.

The changes introduced by Jason were highly detrimental to the survival of Judaism, and in the end would have meant its destruction. But Jason must have thought that he could proceed with moderate Hellenization of Jerusalem, and still retain Jewish religious worship as the way of life of the people.

The general assumption that Jason was an apostate is, in-

[82] For the ancestry and family connections of Menelaus, see Additional Note E.

[83] So Tscherikower, p. 204, and apparently also E. Meyer, Ursprung u. Anfaenge d. Christentums, II, 146–148. A slightly deviating view of the situation is taken by E. Bickermann, Der Gott der Makkabaeer, pp. 64 ff. According to him, the moderate policy of Jason might have remained acceptable to the Jews, had not Antiochus IV purposely interfered. On the other hand, W. W. Tarn, Hellenistic Civilization, 1927, p. 170, sees no religious import in the quarrel between the Oniads and the Tobiads. His view seems to be shared by E. R. Bevan in Cambridge Ancient History, VIII, 502 ff.

deed, based only on *ex parte* evidence, namely the view taken of him by the Maccabees and their followers, who had every reason to present him in the worst possible colors. He was the last high priest of the ancient family of Zadok. The Maccabees, beginning with Jonathan, had usurped the high priestly dignity. Indeed, the right of the Maccabees to the high priesthood had ultimately to be established through a "great assembly" summoned under the high priesthood of Simeon, which declared (I Maccabees 14. 41) that Simeon was to be "their leader and high priest forever until a faithful prophet should arise." The "faithful prophet," when he appeared, would decide the status of the Hasmonean dynasty, and also that of the family which they had displaced. Since this displacement of the Zadokide high priestly dynasty which had functioned in the Temple for seven centuries and more, could be justified only if the legitimate dynasty was such that its scions could no longer be considered eligible for the office, the historians of the time were thus virtually compelled to make out a strong case against Jason. Jason had to be presented as a man unworthy for the high priesthood, no matter what his ancestry might be. Hence the emphatic declaration in II Maccabees 4. 13, referring to Jason, "No high priest he!"

The report, however, is without corroboration. Indeed, there is some evidence that earlier writers, whatever they may have thought of Jason's action in displacing his brother Onias, and of the assimilation which he either sponsored or permitted, had little to say in especial condemnation of him. Thus the following passage in Daniel seems to indicate that the apocalyptist regarded the year 172-171, that which marked the removal of Jason, as the one which ushered in the worst seven year cycle in Jewish history: [84]

"Seventy weeks are decreed upon thy people and upon the holy city, to finish the transgression, and to make an end of sin, and to blot out iniquity, and to bring in everlasting righteousness, and to seal vision and prophet, and to anoint the most holy place. Know therefore and discern that from the going forth of the word to restore and build Jerusalem unto an anointed one, a prince, shall be seven weeks; and three-score and two weeks it shall be

[84] The translation follows, generally, that of R. H. Charles, in his Commentary on Daniel.

built again . . . ; and after three-score and two weeks shall an anointed one be cut off . . . and the city and the sanctuary shall be destroyed, together with a prince, . . . and a stringent statute shall be issued against the many for one week; and for half of the week, the sacrifice and meat offering shall cease, and in its stead shall be a horror which appalleth" (Daniel 9. 24–27).

The expression, "the anointed one shall be cut off" in this passage is usually interpreted to refer to the murder of Onias,[85] the high priest whom Jason displaced, at the hands of the Syrian Andronicus. But this interpretation is itself based on prejudices deriving ultimately from the story as told in II Maccabees. Considered in its context, and without any prejudgment based on II Maccabees, the passage is more naturally interpreted as referring to the removal of Jason from the high priesthood.[86] The apocalyptist sees the period of seventy sabbatical cycles divided into three parts. During the first seven sabbatical cycles (i.e. 581–538 B.C.) there is to be neither high priest nor sacrifice. During the succeeding sixty-two sabbatical cycles, into which the author expands the period 538–172 B.C.,[87] the high priestly family will function again, and sacrifices are offered. Then in the last sabbatical cycle, beginning with 172–171 B.C., and expected to end in 165–164 B.C., there will again be no rightful high pries[t]; and in the second half of this sabbatical cycle, the Temple will be profaned through its being dedicated to Baal Shamem, and through the offering of profane sacrifices. The period 172–170 B.C. is thus noteworthy not so much for the death of a displaced, former high priest, but for the removal of the rightful incumbent of the office, and the displacement of the ancient high priestly dynasty — in other words, for the displacement of Jason by Menelaus.

[85] So R. H. Charles, op. cit., p. 247; E. Meyer, II, 150; W. Kolbe, Beitraege z. syrischen u. juedischen Geschichte, p. 101.

[86] So J. Wellhausen, op. cit., p. 239, note. It is not necessary to follow Wellhausen in his rejection of the story of Onias' assassination, as related in II Macc. 4. 34, in order to accept his interpretation of the passage in Daniel. It seems to me probable that the story of the murder of Onias is authentic; nevertheless, the passage in Daniel does not seem to me to refer to it.

[87] See Schuerer, Geschichte des Volkes Israel[4], III, 266 ff. It is interesting to note that the writers of the earlier period expanded the pre-Seleucid period of the Second Jewish Commonwealth, while since the time of R. Jose and his Seder Olam, Jewish tradition has foreshortened that period.

Clearly this contemporary record does not agree with II Maccabees in holding that the appointment of Jason was the beginning of Jewish apostasy.

The same view seems to be reflected in the source on which Josephus drew for the summary of the events leading to the pre-Maccabean crises. In both the War (I, 31) and the Antiquities, XII, 238 (5, 1) Josephus completely omits all reference to the Hellenizing activities of Jason; indeed, in the War, Jason remains quite unmentioned. The assimilationist endeavor is ascribed in the War to the Tobiads, and in the Antiquities to Menelaus. While it is true that both accounts of Josephus are highly confused, it is nevertheless clear that the tradition he used did not record Jason as the arch-apostate, described in II Maccabees.

The account of the proceedings, retained in the Talmudic traditions, likewise appears to attach little blame to Jason. Despite its obviously legendary character, this account is of some importance, for the element of factual history which it recalls. According to this story, preserved in both the Babylonian and Palestinian Talmudim,[88] Simeon the Righteous "at his death told those present that his son, Onias, should succeed him. Onias' brother, Simeon, who was the elder by two and a half years, was moved to jealousy by this. In his indignation, Simeon said to Onias, 'Come, and let me teach thee the manner of the Temple service (by the high priest).' Simeon thereupon dressed his brother Onias in a close-fitting dress and a girdle" (both parts of the usual women's apparel) "and brought him to the altar. There, Simeon said to his fellow-priests, 'Behold the promise which Onias made to his mistress, and how he has kept it! (He promised her) that on the day when he would officiate as high priest, he would wear her garment and girdle!' The other priests hearing this would have slain Onias, but he fled from them to Alexandria in Egypt."

Clearly this tradition confuses[89] Simeon the Benjaminite, who "fell out with the high priest (Onias) over the management of the city market" (II Maccabees 3. 4), with Jason,

[88] B. Menahot 109b; Yer. Yoma 6. 3, 43c.

[89] Zeeb Yavetz, Toledot Yisrael, IV, 1900, Appendix, pp. 15 ff.

the brother of Onias; and hence telescopes the two quarrels, — the original struggle of Simeon the Benjaminite against Onias, regarding the markets, and the later one of Jason, the brother of Onias, for the high priesthood — into one. But it is obvious from the account, that the tradition which the Rabbinical academies preserved, did not recall Jason as an arch-Hellenizer or apostate. Otherwise, something of the sense of outrage that so unworthy a son of Simeon the Righteous should have succeeded to the high priesthood, would doubtless have been reflected even in the legend. This fact is particularly important because the account — perhaps in a somewhat earlier version — seems to have existed in the time of Josephus and to have been used by him.

The realization that Jason was at the utmost a moderate Hellenizer, and that his activities as described in II Maccabees 4. 8 ff. were in the nature of a compromise between the extremists of the two opposing factions, bears profoundly, as we shall presently see, on the dating of the documents preserved in the Passover Haggadah.

Before attempting to demonstrate the bearing of the character of Jason on the problem before us, it is important that we summarize briefly the international events which were bringing the situation in Jerusalem to a crisis between the years 175 and 167 B.C.

In 173 B.C., the reigning Queen of Egypt, Cleopatra, the widow of Ptolemy V, died; and was succeeded by Ptolemy VI Philometor, a youth under the dominance of the violently anti-Seleucid party. One of the leading members of this group was Lenaeus, a native of Coele-Syria, who like his fellow-partisans, had never accepted the cession of Palestine and Coele-Syria to the Syrian government. The new rulers of Egypt almost immediately initiated warlike movements, and only the appearance of Antiochus IV at the head of an army, which came down the Palestinian coast to Joppa, prevented them from attempting an invasion at once.

It was obvious that war would momentarily break out; and under these circumstances, a strong and extreme pro-Seleucid high priest was desirable in Jerusalem. It was apparently by

stressing this need, and presenting himself as the person best equipped to fill it, that Menelaus obtained the high priesthood from Antiochus IV. Menelaus' activities, after he became high priest, fully justified Antiochus' expectations. He turned over the Temple treasures to the Seleucids to help them carry on the war; and doubtless proved himself a willing tool in the hands of the Seleucids in all their undertakings.

In the light of these facts, we can hardly attribute the origin of the pro-Seleucid document, B, to the pro-Egyptian Onias II. Before the year 175, it would also not have been urgent to replace A with some other formula of opening the Passover Haggadah. That year, which marks the end of Onias' high priesthood, and also the beginning of the more vigorous policy of imperial integration by Antiochus IV, seems to be the *terminus a quo* for B.

On the other hand, it is inconceivable that any innovation introduced into the Temple by Menelaus would be countenanced by any Temple authorities of later times. Even Alcimus who followed him, would doubtless have rejected a formula which had been introduced by Menelaus.[90]

We may therefore with a high degree of probability attribute the origin of B and its introduction into the Passover Haggadah to the High Priest Jason, 175–172 B.C. Both its pro-Seleucid overtones, on the one hand, and its insistence on the importance of Jewish worship, on the other, would seem to point to this moderate Hellenist as the author. Once introduced by Jason, B would naturally be retained by Menelaus, his successor; and by Alcimus who apparently was, like Jason, a moderate Hellenist. Indeed, as we have seen, the Jews, regarding the description of their origin in B as far more flattering to themselves

[90] It is not clear whether Alcimus belonged to the Zadokide dynasty. In I Macc. 7. 14, he is described as "a priest of the seed of Aaron." But this failure of the historian to refer to any Zadokide antecedents of Alcimus may be due to a desire to avoid giving offense to the Maccabees. It is clear that Alcimus received the office of High Priest as a moderate; this is implied in the sympathy which the Hasideans expressed for him (ibid.). It is noteworthy, in this connection, that Alcimus was a nephew of the famous Jose ben Joezer, a member of the first Pharisaic "Pair" and hence one of the founders of Pharisaism (see Bereshit Rabbah 65. 22, ed. Theodor, pp. 742–743, Midrash Tehillim 11. 7, ed. Buber 52a). According to the Rabbinic tradition, preserved in these Midrashim, Jose ben Joezer was among those whom Alcimus executed (I Macc. 7. 16).

than that in A, would doubtless be inclined to preserve B, even after the rise of the Maccabees to the high priesthood and to independence.

We have seen above that A served as introduction to M.[91] The question must naturally arise whether any change was made with regard to M, when the pro-Seleucid high priest replaced A with B. We have no explicit information on the point. The Mishna, and the interpretation put upon it by Rab,[92] imply that, while B replaced A as introduction to the Passover Haggadah, M was still recited in its original form. But this may reflect the practice of a later period, and not the original action of the Temple authorities in the pre-Maccabean decade.

Fragments recovered from the Genizah, which have preserved a ritual containing B but not A (following therefore the prescription of Rab), usually contain M in a somewhat abbreviated form.[93] But a responsum of Rab Natronai Gaon indicates that he knew of a ritual which, containing B (in a slightly modified form) rejected M entirely, and retained only the recitation of the Scriptural passage on which M is based, namely Deuteronomy 26. 5–8.[94] Rab Natronai, when asked about the propriety of using this ritual for the Passover evening service, unreservedly denounces it. He holds such a ritual, omitting the commentary on Deuteronomy 26. 5–8, heretical. "Thus said Rab Natronai," we are told in Seder Rab Amram,[95] "A person who in the *Kiddush* (the blessing of sanctification) of Passover uses the formula, 'He Who sanctified Israel,' and at the conclusion of the questions of the child does not say, 'We were Pharaoh's bondmen in Egypt,' nor 'In the beginning our ancestors were worshippers of idols,' but simply the passage, '*And Joshua said*,' etc., until '*Jacob and his sons went down into Egypt*;' and then recites the blessing, 'Blessed is He, Who has preserved His promise to Israel,' and reads the passage, '*arami*

[91] Above, p. 303.

[92] See above, p. 307.

[93] See above, note 35.

[94] Siddur Rab Amram, ed. Warsaw, 1865, 37b; ed. Frumkin, II, 103b; B. M. Lewin, Ozar Ha-Geonim, III, p. 89.

[95] Loc. cit.

'obed 'abi ('my father was a wandering Aramaean') until he completes the passage, precisely as it is in Scripture, without adding the Rabbinical commentary; and then recites the statement of Rabban Gamaliel, the blessing for the redemption, and *Hallel*, — I am very much astonished at such a custom. There is no doubt that a person who follows this custom has failed to fulfil his obligation. But beyond that, he who observes this practice must be declared a heretic, a person divided in his loyalty (to Judaism), one who rejects the teachings of the Sages, and holds the words of the Mishna and the Talmud in contempt. All the communities are under obligation to excommunicate him, and to expel him from the congregation of Israel. . . . Such men are the disciples of Anan (i.e., members of the Karaite sect) . . . who said to his followers, 'Forsake the words of the Mishna and the Talmud, and I will create for you a new Talmud of my own.'"

While it was quite natural for the Gaon to identify this ritual, which he so vigorously opposes, with that of the Karaites, we now know that his view could hardly have been correct. No Karaite writer would have included in a ritual a quotation from the Mishna and particularly a statement by Rabban Gamaliel, one of the most famous of the Talmudic Sages, and the grandson of Hillel. No member of that sect would have agreed to retain the blessings introduced by the Rabbinic Sages (to which Rab Natronai refers as parts of the ritual); nor would the sect preserve the questions formulated in the Mishna for the inquiring child. The ritual denounced by Rab Natronai is therefore definitely not of Karaite origin.[96] On the other hand, Rab Natronai is certainly correct in declaring that the ritual runs counter to all the teachings of the Mishna and the Talmud. We must conclude that this ritual in its original form derived from a period earlier than the Mishna; and though it had been supplemented by Rab Natronai's day, with material deriving from the Mishna itself, it had not lost its main distinguishing characteristics: namely the rejection of A, and the use of B as

[96] J. Lewy in Ein Vortrag ueber d. Ritual d. Pesach-Abends, Breslau, 1904, p. 17 is uncertain regarding the Karaite origin of the ritual cited by Rab Natronai. I. Abrahams categorically denies the possible Karaite character of the work (Jewish Quarterly Review, X, 1898, p. 41)

introduction. It may well be, therefore, that this ritual denounced by Rab Natronai, was in its origin, that introduced in the second century B.C. when the first form of the Passover Haggadah was revised. If this surmise is correct, it follows that when B was substituted for A, M also was rejected, and was replaced by the simple reading of Deuteronomy 26. 5–8.

This would be a change entirely in conformity with the substitution of B for A; for M is definitely Egyptophilic, and would doubtless be as objectionable to the pro-Seleucids as A itself.

Whether the pro-Seleucid revisers retained any part of M in their Haggadah, or rejected it completely, it seems obvious that they ended the quotation from Joshua which they used for B precisely where it ends in the current rituals, namely with the words, "But Jacob and his sons went down into Egypt" (Joshua 24. 4). Their unwillingness to retain the remainder of the passage in Joshua as a record of the Egyptian bondage and the Exodus may have been due to the fact that the passage in Deuteronomy 26. 5–8 was so much better known. But it may also have been due to the fact that Joshua 24. 5 specifically makes mention of Moses and Aaron, as the Divine instruments through whom Israel was redeemed from Egypt. The high priests, and the writers who worked under their direction, definitely avoided any mention of either of these two prophets in connection with the Exodus. To stress the importance of Moses would be to assign an importance to the non-priestly Levites, which was, in the opinion of the high priests, undesirable. And even an emphasis on Aaron might give an importance to the non-Zadokide priesthood,[97] which as we have seen was struggling for recognition during this period.

It thus becomes likely that the older form of the Passover Haggadah consisting of AM was basically revised in the early part of the second century B.C., most probably during the high priesthood of Jason, 175–172 B.C., by the substitution of B, plus Deuteronomy 26. 5–8 for AM. We shall presently see that in all probability, the recitation of this revised Haggadah was followed by the recital or singing of the poem Dayyenu, still preserved in the current rituals of the Haggadah.

[97] See above, note 77.

NOTE 1

[1] The text of the Passover Haggadah has been transmitted in a variety of rituals, and is extant in a vast number of manuscripts and printed editions. S. Wiener, Bibliographie der Oster-Haggadah, lists no less than 895 editions which appeared before 1900. His list has been supplemented by A. Jaari in Kiryat Sefer VI, 1929–30, 531–562; and VIII, 1931–32, 122–126; A. Duker, ibid. VII, 1930–31, 574–584; VIII, 1931–32, 100–121; I. Rivkind, ibid. XII, 1935–36, 230 ff., 360 ff.; B. Simches, ibid. XIII, 1936–37, 138; and Rachel Bernstein-Wischnitzer, bibliography to article Haggadah in Universal Jewish Encyclopedia, Vol. VII. Rivkind's bibliography includes an invaluable compilation of discussions of the history of the Haggadah as a whole, as well as of its various sections. For the purposes of this study I have consulted the following texts representing various rituals of the Passover Haggadah. (The letters indicate the *sigla* used in this article for the various texts.)

(A) Seder R. Amram, Warsaw, 1865, 37b, ff.; cf. A. Marx, Untersuchungen zum Siddur d. Gaon R. Amram (offprint. from Jahrbuch d. jued.-literarischen Gesellschaft V) Berlin, 1908, and Seder R. Amram Ha-Shalem, ed. Frumkin, Jerusalem, 1912, II, 103a, ff.;

(B) Siddur R. Saadia Gaon, ed. I. Davidson, S. Assaf, B. I. Joel, Jerusalem, 1941, 134 ff.;

(C) The Haggadah according to the Rite of Yemen, ed. by W. H. Greenburg, London, 1896, cf. (Ca) Tiklal, Jerusalem, 1894, II, 9a, ff. (Yemenite ritual);

(D) Maimonides, Yad Ha-Hazakah, ed. pr. Rome, 1480 (probably Egyptian ritual);

(E) Haggadah Shel Pesah, Bagdad, 1904 (Bagdad ritual, cf. with this text, the descriptions of the manuscripts of the Bagdad ritual given in D. Sassoon, Ohel David, Descriptive Catalogue of the Hebrew and Samaritan Manuscripts in the Sassoon Library, London, 1932, I, pp. 234–236; II, 836–837);

(F) Manuscript from the Enelow Collection, in the Library of the Jewish Theological Seminary of America, written in Bombay, about 1850;

(G) Manuscript of the Haggadah according to a Syrian rite, in the Library of the Jewish Theological Seminary of America;

(H) Manuscript of the Haggadah, in the Library of the Jewish Theological Seminary of America, written in an oriental hand, and containing an Arabic translation;

(I) Manuscript of an Arabic translation of the Haggadah, in the Library of the Jewish Theological Seminary of America, written in Iraq, in the seventeenth century, and marked minhag Babel;

(J) Fragment of a shorthand Haggadah, described in Jewish Quarterly Review, IX, 1897, pp. 520 f.;

(K) Egyptian Fragments of the Passover Haggadah, published by I. Abrahams in Jewish Quarterly Review, X, 1898, pp. 41 ff. (cf. also ibid., pp. 380–382);

(L) A fragment of the Passover Haggadah, described by Julius Greenstone in Zeitschrift f. hebraeische Bibliographie, XV, 1911, pp. 122–123;

(M) Fragment of the Passover Haggadah published by Prof. Louis Ginzberg in Ginze Schechter, II, pp. 259 ff. (reprinted by B. M. Lewin, Ozar Ha-Geonim III, 154 ff.);

(N) Genizah fragments in the E. N. Adler Collection of the Library of the Jewish Theological Seminary of America, cited as follows:

(Na) 696, 1 ff.;
(Nb) 2755, f. 7;
(Nc) 2841, ff. 39–40;
(Nd) 2845, f. 4;
(Ne) 2857, ff. 13–14;
(Nf) 2919, f. 29;
(Ng) 2935, f. 4;
(Nh) ibid., f. 13;
(Ni) 2945, f. 21;
(Nj) 3130, f. 7;
(Nk) 3214, f. 4;
(Nl) 3222, f. 2;
(Nm) 3288, ff. 7, 8;
(Nn) ibid., f. 11;
(No) 3762, ff. 1–4;

(O) Mahzor Romania, Venice, 1526, IIIa, ff. (Balkan ritual);

(P) Mahzor Turin, according to the collated readings prepared by Solomon Schechter from a manuscript in the Library in Turin. (The original manuscript has since that time been destroyed by fire, so that Schechter's collations remain the only witnesses to the text. They are now in the Library of the Jewish Theological Seminary of America.) Cf. A. Schechter, Studies in Jewish Liturgy, Philadelphia, 1930;

(Q) Shibbale Ha-Leket, by R. Zedekiah ben Abraham, ed. S. Buber, Vilna, 1886, 93a, ff. (Italian ritual);

(Qa) Italian Prayer Book, Bologna, 1541 (later Italian ritual);

(R) The Book of Prayer and Order of Service according to the Custom of the Spanish and Portuguese Jews, edited by M. Gaster, London, 1931, V, pp. 24 ff.;

(S) Spanish Prayer Book, Cod. Adler 1337, in the Library of the Jewish Theological Seminary of America, described by Prof. A. Marx in Jewish Quarterly Review, N. S., XIX, 1929, p. 14, note;

(Sa) Spanish Prayer Book, manuscript of the fifteenth century, described in the article by Prof. A. Marx, loc. cit., note 2;

(Sb) Haggadah, according to manuscript of Spanish Prayer Book, 15th century, in 2 vols. in the Library of the Jewish Theological Seminary of America;

(Sc) Text of the Haggadah in Orhot Hayyim of R. Aaron Ha-Kohen of Lunel, I, Florence, 1750, 82a, ff.;

(Sd) Kol Bo, Section 51;

(T) Mahzor Vitry, ed. Hurwitz, Nurenberg, 1923, pp. 291 ff. (Old French ritual);

(Ta) Manuscript of Mahzor Vitry in the Library of the Jewish Theological Seminary of America;

(Tb) Haggadah in manuscript of Siddur Zarfat, dated 1294, described by Prof. Marx, op. cit., p. 10;

(Tc) Sefer Ha-Orah, ed. Buber, pp. 105 ff.;

(U) Ez Hayyim, by R. Jacob ben Judah of London, as transcribed and published by David Kaufmann, in Jewish Quarterly Review, IV, 1892, pp. 550 ff. (ritual of pre-expulsion England);

(V) Manuscript Jewish Theological Seminary, described by Professor Marx, op. cit., p. 10, written in Worms, 1329 (ancient Rhineland ritual, with traces of foreign influence);

(Va) Minhag Ashkenaz, ed. pr., date unknown, probably *ca.* 1490;

(Vb) Mahzor, Minhag Ashkenaz, Soncino, 1486;

(W) Manuscript of the Haggadah service of the Crimean Jews, in the Library of the Jewish Theological Seminary of America;

(X) First ed. of Passover Haggadah, printed separately, Soncino, 1486;

(Z) The text of the Darmstadt Manuscript of the Passover Haggadah, as given by Bruno Italiener in Die Darmstaedter Pessach-Haggadah, Leipzig, 1927, p. 131. (The other texts cited by Italiener are cited by reference to the page on which the particular ritual is described in his book. With further reference to this work see the review of Professor Alexander Marx, Jewish Quarterly Review, N. S., XIX, 1928–29, pp. 1 ff.)

Further light is shed on the text of the Passover Haggadah by reference to the commentaries, particularly those of Abrabanel and of Abudarham (both Spanish rite). Of the Haggadahs published in recent times, the most valuable from the point of view of textual studies are: E. D. Goldschmidt, Die Pessach-Haggada, Berlin, 1936; and Cecil Roth, The Haggadah, a New Edition, with English translation, introduction and notes, London, 1934. A good selection of Rabbinic commentaries has been reprinted together with the text of the Haggadah, by J. D. Eisenstein, Ozar Perushim ve-Ziyyurim, Haggadah shel Pesach, New York, 1920. For discussions of the history of the Passover Haggadah, see, in addition to the works cited in the text of this article, the following: A. Spanier, art. Haggada in Encyclopaedia Judaica, Vol. VII; and articles "Haggadah, Passover," in Universal Jewish Encyclopedia, Vol. V by A. Spanier, I. Elbogen, and Rachel Bernstein-Wischnitzer; M. Friedmann, Meir ayyin al seder vehaggadah shel lele pesah, Vienna, 1901 (herein Friedmann); E. Baneth, Der Sederabend, Berlin, 1904; J. Lewy, Ein Vortrag u. das Ritual d. Pesach-Abends, Breslau, 1904; and introductions of Goldschmidt and Cecil Roth to their editions of the Haggadah already noted. I am under great obligations to Professor Alexander Marx, Librarian of the Jewish Theological Seminary of America, for making available to me the manuscripts and most of the printed works enumerated above, and others, which will be mentioned hereafter. It is a pleasant duty to express my gratitude also to the librarians of Columbia University, Dropsie College, the Jewish Institute of Religion, and Union Theological Seminary for their unfailing helpfulness and courtesy.

TO BE CONTINUED